

5

THE
FIDELITY
OF THE
BIBLE!

Being a Review of Colenso's Writings against the
Pentateuch and Book of Joshua.

BY THE
REV. JOHN STRAITH

MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL.

"The Scriptures cannot be broken."

INGERSOLL:
PRINTED AT THE "INQUIRER" OFFICE, KING STREET.
1864.

ELIOT

BIBLE

T
acc
auth
prie
such
pois
boo
T
sho
and
The
of
con
we
so.
the
Se
ob
the
be
ag
en
ex
re
be
to
in
so
an
w
de
th
fi
th
ti

P R E F A C E .

The most of this little pamphlet was prepared long ago, but on account of numerous duties which required all the time of the author, it remained unfinished till he became doubtful of the propriety of publishing it at all. There are some who think that such works only serve to propagate more extensively, the moral poison which it is intended to destroy, as they bring the reviewed book anew into notice.

The author of these lines does not think that the friends of truth should be afraid to face the foe, nor is ignorance of the manner and matter of an enemy's assault the best security or defence. The Bible has nothing to fear from the most intense examination of all that its adversaries ever try to bring against it. On the contrary, I am convinced that the Berean course is right, and that we should "search the Scriptures daily whither these things are so." Nay, more—I am confident that a careful investigation of these so called difficulties will confirm every student that the Scriptures are the word of God, and infallibly true. Not only do the objections disappear; new evidences make their appearance which the reader never before thought of. In fact, they multiply till they become overwhelming, and the faith of the reader becomes steeled against any and every infidel attack. At least, such is my experience. I have often been pained to hear intelligent christians express themselves as if they were doubtful that no common reader could venture to read such a book as that of Colenso's, because no ordinary man could touch his arguments. This seemed to me like a heartless surrender to the enemy without a single stroke in the battle-field. Moreover, it implied that one must be a great scholar, and have a giant mind, before he could know his Bible, and hold his ground against infidelity. I should say that the man who knows his Bible *well*, if he never saw another book, may bid defiance to all the crafty assaults of all the scholarly infidels in the world.

It is in the hope of demonstrating this proposition that the following treatise is offered to the public:—It is not pretended that the material is all original. Having read first Colenso's book, and filed such answers as occurred to my mind, I then read several

others to see how our views might compare; I found a remarkable agreement in many cases. "The various publications which have come under my notice are very good; but I felt that there might be improvements on every one of them. Most of them, I think, miss what I believe to be the very essence of Colenso's chief error. I thought that a mind inferior to any of these able authors, with the assistance of their productions, might provide a more brief, more clear, and yet more satisfactory reply to Bishop Colenso. I wish it therefore, to be understood, that for much of what is contained in these pages I have been indebted to Dr. A. McCaul, of London, Prof. Green, of Princeton, and several others; while I have ventured to advance some things of importance not to be found in any book I have seen.

I hope the perusal of this little book may be a pleasure to the reader, and that the effect upon his mind may be such as was made upon mine by the study of the subject, viz.:—a most firm conviction that "The Scripture cannot be broken;" "that sooner will heaven and earth pass away, than one jot or one tittle of the law fail." I shall have failed in my object if the reader do not rise from the perusal of these pages, with a higher reverence for the word of God, and a better appreciation of its infallible character, and eternally and infinitely important contents.

OCTOBER 16th, 1864.

THE AUTHOR.

THE FIDELITY OF THE BIBLE.

CHAPTER I.

COLENZO'S PREFACE.

In his preface Colenso insinuates many and grievous charges against the morality and scientific accuracy of the Pentateuch, together with other truths which he thinks proper to attack only with a sneer—as if that alone would make us ashamed of them, and disown them for ever. He says that a native of Natal, when helping him to translate the story of the deluge, asked, "Is all that true? Do you really believe that all this happened thus,—that all the beasts and birds, and creeping things upon the earth, large and small, from hot countries and cold, came thus by pairs, and entered the ark with Noah? And did Noah provide food for them all—for the beasts of prey as well as the rest?" My heart answered in the words of the prophet: "Shall a man speak lies in the name of the Lord? I dared not do so."

It would be wasting time to answer such an insinuation as this. Surely, any one who believes in God at all, will not doubt that He who made, can easily collect his creatures by pairs, or any other way at will. Nor need the Bishop have any fears about the capacity of the Ark, which, according to the best computation, could contain a pair of every *genera* of living creatures, with food for them, and twenty thousand men besides.

The Bishop thinks the account of the miracle, (Joshua, x. 13)—of the sun standing still, and the moon staying—hard to understand, and harder to believe. He observes, that if it were accomplished by the stopping of the earth's diurnal motion, then "A man's feet would be arrested while his body would be moving at the rate (on the equator), of one thousand miles an hour; so that every human being and animal would be dashed to pieces in a moment," &c. How ridiculous and childish this reasoning! Whether is it easier to say to the whole mass of the earth, stop, or to say the same word to the individuals, and little particles on its surface? Surely, if we admit that God's power can stop the whole earth in its motion, how easy it would be to keep the little things

upon it, in proper order. I think we had better leave the Almighty to work his own miracles, without setting bounds to his power, or wondering how they could be done. The most remarkable logic is the following:—

“The Bible says the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, (p. 9.) and the arresting of the earth's motion, while it might cause the appearance of the sun standing still, would not account for the moon staying.”

I venture a little school boy would be disposed to laugh at that statement. It shows how men, of famous mathematical conceit, do sometimes make incredible blunders. A beginner, in his lessons in Geography, could tell you that the ceasing of the diurnal motion of the earth, would make the sun and moon appear to stand still, while the latter, in twelve hours, would seem to recede about six and a half degrees, which could scarcely be noticed by an ordinary observer. Such are some of the evidences upon which Colenso would have us believe that the Pentateuch is not historically true!

There is one paragraph in his preface which this Bishop would have done well to study. It is itself a most powerful argument against his whole book. I shall transcribe it. Here it is: (Page 16).

“Besides which, it should be remembered always, (as a friend very justly observed), that, in forming an estimate of ancient documents, of the early Scriptures, especially, we are doing that which is like examining judicially, the case of one who is absent, and unable to give his own account of the matter. We should be very scrupulous about assuming, that it is impossible to explain satisfactorily, this or that, apparent inconsistency, contradiction, or other anomaly, and charging him with dishonesty of purpose, considering that ours is an *ex-parte* statement, and incapable of being submitted to the party against whom it is made.”

This is a most reasonable rule. Colenso admits it, and yet, in the teeth of it, he always insists upon the letter of the Scriptures, and not only so, but fills up the history with suppositions of his own wholly at variance with what is written.

In many cases, also, he refuses to take into account that there may have been many things which the inspired historian did not record. If all the events connected with what is recorded, had been written, what a bulky Bible we should have had! The able Professor Green has this pertinent remark on this subject:—

“No statement is ever made, and no narrative ever related, without leaving much to be supplied mentally by the hearer or reader. Everything can be converted into an absurdity, if no allowances are to be made—nothing to be admitted which is not in the letter of the narrative, however clearly it may imply it. Such a state-

ment
is not
arithm
could
carried
might
as “
the s
show
order
about
ties a
utter
Su
brin
shou
as h
grea
in th
The
Chu
says
our
wha
bo
tha
tion
wro
of t
wh
—P
Bib
I
dig
mu
fac
Nu
wi
do
ill
br
fo
th
an
al

ment as, The Prince of Wales visited America, implies much that is not written. An objector like Colenso might figure out by his arithmetic how many miles of ocean lay between—how far a man could swim in a day—how many pounds of provisions he must have carried on his back to serve him on the water, &c.; and, if one might suggest the idea of a ship, such as Colenso would scout it as “a pure assumption unwarranted by anything that is found in the statement under examination.”—(Col. P. 144); “and only showing how men will do violence to the plain reading of it in order to evade a difficulty.”—(P. 64.) “The story says nothing about this vessel, &c.” “This story involves so many impossibilities and absurdities that I do not hesitate to declare this statement utterly incredible, and impossible.”—(P. 144.)

Such is a sample of the arguments which the Bishop of Natal brings against the Bible. He insists that the English Church should break down her bulwarks, and make room for such infidels as himself within her pale. He imagines he is destined to be a great reformer in that Church. We have often said that a traitor, in the camp, is more to be dreaded than an enemy in the field. The English Church has need of reform; hut heaven save all Churches from such reformers as Colenso. But hear him. He says—(P. 36.) “I trust that we shall not rest until the system of our Church be reformed, and her boundaries enlarged to make her what a National Church should be. Should the reception of this book, by the more thoughtful portion of the community, indicate that such a reform is possible and probable, it will be but a question of time, &c.” So it seems there is to be a grand reform wrought in the churches—and what is that reform? The removal of the very foundation of all evangelical churches—the Bible; or what is the same thing, or worse, it is to be regarded as incredible—preposterous in its matter. When a man breaks loose from his Bible, there is no limit to his frenzy and conceit.

In keeping with these remarks is another statement of this dignitary, (S. 172) which reads thus:—“But how thankful we must be, that we are no longer obliged to believe, as a matter of fact, of vital consequence to our eternal hope, the story related in Num. xxxi.” A writer well remarks in irony, “The world will breathe freely, now that Colenso has arisen.” It would no doubt be a matter of thankfulness to many whose conscience is ill at ease, if they could prove the Bible—a fable. “Let us break their bands assunder, and cast their cords from us.” Alas for the man who calls it a relief to be delivered from his faith in the Bible, or any part of it. We would say to such: “Glory not, and lie not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual devilish.”—(Jas. iii., 14 & 15.)

In his introductory remarks Colenso lays down his wisdom thus :
 "The Pentateuch, as a whole, cannot possibly have been written by Moses, or by any one acquainted, personally, with the facts which it professes to describe; and, further, that the (so called) Mosaic narrative, by whomsoever written, and though imparting to us, as I fully believe it does, revelations of the Divine Will and character, cannot be regarded as *historically true*."

He follows up this proposition with many insinuations, artfully fitted to bias the mind of the reader, against the Scriptures. Just as men sometimes attack, in a cowardly manner, the character of a neighbor, with insinuating epithets, which do not expose them to an action at law. For example, he states in regard to his objections, that :—

"They are not such even as are raised, when we regard the trivial nature of a vast number of conversations, and commands, ascribed directly to Jehovah, especially the multiplied ceremonial minutiae laid down in the Levitical law."

It would seem this great "reformer" entertains the old heathenish doctrine; that it would be beneath the dignity of God to concern himself about what *he* would call little things. According to the Bishop's philosophy, the Lord might give the great body of law, but not the details of it. He might give the big volume, but not the chapters and little verses—the whole, but not the parts! Does Colenso believe that the Great God made him at all? and did he concern himself about the nails of his fingers, or "the hairs of his head?" Did He create a world, and yet not the atoms composing it? It is, to one who has right thoughts of God, a blessed and comforting evidence of the Divinity of the Bible, that it represents our Father in heaven as caring for all things—the little as well as the large—"the sparrow,"—"the lily,"—"the grass of the field," and "the hairs of your head." If our God did not take account of small, and even worthless things, how should He ever have thought on us?

There is another paragraph in the preface which I shall notice more particularly, as I think the question there stated, is very commonly misunderstood, even by many intelligent christians. It refers to

HEBREW SLAVERY.

He says :—

"They (his objections) are not such, even as must be started at once in most pious minds, when such words as these are read, professedly coming from the Holy and Blessed One—"The Father," and "Faithful Creator of Mankind."

"If the master (of a Hebrew servant), have given him a wife, and she have born him sons or daughters, *the wife and her children shall be her masters*, and he shall go out free by himself." (Ex. xxi: 4). The wife and children, in such a case, being placed under the protection of such words as these:—

"If a man smite his servant or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall be surely punished; notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, *for he is his money.*"—(Ex. xxi.: 20 & 22.)

Colenso then proceeds to magnify and endorse the "revulsion of feeling with, which he says, an intelligent christian native heard these words: "His whole soul revolted against the notion that the Great and Blessed God, the Merciful Father of all mankind would speak of a servant or maid" as mere "money," and allow a horrible crime to go unpunished, &c.

It is painful to see the irreverent and sneering manner in which this Bishop tampers with the word of God, while he is evidently ignorant of its meaning. One would think that the very form of expression in this passage would have led any reader to observe that the meaning could not be absolutely according to the letter. Silver and gold were "current money with the merchants." No rational reader will say that the slaves could be money, in the literal sense; they would surely be clumsy cash. We are, therefore, compelled to seek out the meaning of the expression—"He is his money." It must be discovered by a rational examination of Hebrew Scripture, and we need not search long to find it out.

The texts, at whose equity and morality Colenso cavals so much, are found in Ex. xxi., a portion of Scripture which immediately follows the decalogue. In order to judge of any text, it is a well known principle that we must take account of its connections, or, what is usually called, the context. Let us see these verses that are so summarily condemned: Verse 1—4: "Now these are the judgments which thou shalt set before them. If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve, and in the seventh he shall go out, by himself; if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. If his master have given him a wife, and she have born him sons or daughters, the wife and her children shall be her masters, and he shall go out by himself."

This is the first passage, and here follows the second: v. 18—21:

"And if men strive together, and one smite another, with a stone, or with his fist, and he die not, but keep his bed; if he rise again, and walk abroad upon his staff, then shall he that smote him, be quit; only, he shall pay for the loss of his time, and shall cause him to be thoroughly healed. And if a man smite his servant or

his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall surely be punished; notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is his money."

Let it be observed, in the first place, that in no case did a man become bound in servitude by the act of another—save in the following cases, or similar ones :

1st. A thief might be sold into a state of servitude, as a fine, imposed for his crime ; just as now, he would be sent to penitentiary. See Ex. xxii: 3.

2nd. An insolvent debtor, (it would seem), by law, became the servant of his creditor. 2 Kings, iv: 1.

3rd. A father might sell his children ; just as at present, he may bind them as apprentices, or otherwise in their nonage. Exodus xxi: 7.

The only other way in which a man could become bound, as a servant, was the most common and ordinary way, viz.: A man might sell himself. Lev. xxv: 39 & 47.

It was made a capital crime for any one to sell another to the nations around them. "He that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death." Ex. xxi: 16. Again : if any master was cruel to a servant, and he escaped from him, every one to whom he might come was bound to shelter him, and not give him up. Deut. xxiii: 15 & 16.

One law regulated servitude among the Hebrews, viz: That none could be bound for a term of more than *seven years*, and even then, he must receive wages in some sort. Deut. xv: 11 & 15. When any one required to hire, it was presumptive evidence, that he was poor, and usually required his wages in *advance*. Hence the natural and obvious meaning of the phrase : "Buy a servant." The amount being already paid for the service, the servant so engaged was the "money" of the master—not that he was a chattel or piece of property ; but his *service* was, which could not be separated from his person, until it was fulfilled. The patriarch, or head of a family held very much the office of a magistrate, or judge, and levied judgment on the guilty. His power, however, was duly guarded and limited ; but in the case of the servant whose wages were already paid, it would be regarded as presumptive evidence that he did not intend undue severity, because it would be contrary to his own interests, "He is his money."

The children of the servant, so bought, were regarded as part of the house-hold to which he belonged, and the master was bound to provide for, and instruct them accordingly. These were

usuall
more
hired
he er
hence
train
capti
fight
house
in th
Ex.
but
xvii
the
prop
H
rises
mas
wou
paid
com
serv
the
obli
a m
loss
pay
pay
he
for
it l
cri
un
"
de
to
wo

sla
wa
an
co
th

usually attached to the master as a father, and were, consequently more reliable and trustworthy than those who were bought (or hired.) Hence Solomon mentions it among the advantages which he enjoyed: "I had servants *born in my house*," (Ecc. ii: 7) hence, also, "Abraham armed three hundred and eighteen of his trained servants, *born in his house*," to recover Lot from captivity.—(Gen. xiv: 14. He could trust to these as sons in fight. There was this distinction between a servant "born in the house," and one "bought with money." The latter was free in the seventh year (unless he voluntarily bound himself again, Ex. xxi: 5). The former was free only when he came of age; but all were under religious instruction, and example, Genesis xvii: 12 & 13. Indeed those that were "born in the house," in the absence of more direct children, were heirs of the master's property. Gen. xv: 3.

Had Colenso considered these things, he would not have been horrified at the idea of a female servant being obliged to remain with her master till she had fulfilled her time. I wonder if he himself would consider it a just law if he hired a maid, for seven years, paid her wages in advance, and then some other servant would come and marry, and take her away, defrauding him of her service, without refunding what he had paid for her. Nor need the husband be separated from his wife; for the master was obliged to keep both, if required. It should be noticed, that, when a man did smite his neighbor, and hurt him, he must *pay for the loss of his time*, and cause him to be thoroughly healed, that is, pay expenses. But, in the case of a servant, he had no right to pay for *the loss of his time*. He had paid for that already, when he bought him. "*He is his money*," seeing it was vested in him for his service, and the fact, that he had paid for his service, made it his interest not to disable him. No brutal murder nor horrible crime could be committed with impunity. The law for such was universal, and took no account of any relations—master or servant. "He that smiteth a man, so that he die, shall surely be put to death." "Thou shalt give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe."

A careful examination of the system of Hebrew servitude, (or slavery, falsely so called), will, we think, convince any one that it was a just and equitable plan, securing the interests of all parties, and most unlike the slavery of the present age. Had Colenso considered well the texts he has condemned, he would have noted the excellence and equity of the law, especially, considering the

age in which it was given, and the people among whom it was to be enforced. There was, by Divine direction, no slavery in Israel after the modern style; but there were prevalent many customs which were tolerated for the time. "The times of this ignorance God winked at, but now commandeth all men, everywhere, to repent."

CHAPTER II.

THE FAMILY OF JUDAH.

The first argument, in due form, brought by Colenso against the authority of the Pentateuch is in substance the following:

In Gen. XLVI. we read: And the sons of Judah, Er and Onan, and Sheelah, and Pharez, and Zarah; but Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan, and the sons of Pharez were Hezron and Hamul.

"It appears to me to be certain," (says C.) "that the writer means to say that Hezron and Hamul were *born in the Land of Canaan*, and were among the seventy persons (including Jacob himself, and Joseph, and his two sons), who *came into Egypt* with Jacob.

"He repeats the words again and again:—"These are the names of the Children of Israel which *came into Egypt*, v. 8;

All the souls, that *came with Jacob into Egypt* which came out of his loins, besides Jacob's son's wives, were three score and six, v. 26—which they would not be without Hezron and Hamul."

In like manner he quotes Ex. 1.: 1 & 5, Deut. x.: 25, and says:

"I assume, then, that it is absolutely undeniable, that the narrative of the Exodus distinctly involves the statement, that the sixty-six persons "out of the loins of Jacob," mentioned in Gen. XLVI., and no others, went down with him into Egypt.

Now Judah was *forty two** years old, according to the story, when he went down with Jacob into Egypt.

But, if we turn to Gen. xxxviii., we shall find that in the course of these forty-two years of Judah's life, the following events are recorded to have happened:

I. Judah grows up, marries a wife—"at that time," v. 1, i. e., after Joseph's being sold into Egypt when he was "seventeen years old," Gen. xxxvii.: 2; and when Judah, consequently, was twenty years old,—and has, separately three sons by her.

* Joseph was thirty years old when he "stood before Pharaoh," as governor of the Land of Egypt.—Gen., xli.: 46; and, from that time nine years elapsed (seven of plenty and two of famine), before Jacob came down to Egypt—at that time, therefore, Joseph was thirty-nine years old. But Judah was about three years older than Joseph: for Judah was born in the fourth year of Jacob's double marriage. Gen. xxix.: 35; and Joseph in the seventh, Gen. xxx. 21 & 26; xxxi.: 41; hence, Judah was forty-two years old when Jacob went down to Egypt.

II. The eldest of those three sons grows up, is married, and dies; the second grows to maturity, suppose in another year, marries his brother's widow, and dies; the third grows to maturity, (suppose in another year still), but declines to take his brother's widow to wife, she then deceives Judah himself, conceives by him, and, in due time, bears him twins, Pharez and Zarah.

III. One of these twins, also, grows to maturity, and has two sons, Hezron and Hamul, born to him before Jacob goes down into Egypt. The above being certainly incredible, we are obliged to conclude, that one of the two accounts must be untrue." Page 61 and 62.

From this Colenso would have us conclude that the Pentateuch is *unhistorical*. Before we leap into such a dark dungeon, let us examine a little, for there will be more serious difficulties compassing that position than any other.

Two things are "assumed" in the above statement: 1st. He "assumes" that it is "undeniable" that the narrative represents that the sixty-six persons, and among them Hezron and Hamul, were born before, and "went down with" Jacob into Egypt. 2nd. He professes to show that Judah was only "forty-two years old, according to the *story*, when he went down with Jacob into Egypt."

We observe, on the contrary, that the "story" affirms neither the one nor the other, nor does it necessarily "involve" either.

In order to understand the meaning of expressions, made by any writer, we must examine his own *usus loquendi*.

It is remarkable that Colenso has, himself, quoted several texts which most plainly upset all his argument. Such as, "All the souls of the house of Jacob, which *came into Egypt*, were three score and ten." Gen. xlv.1.: 27. "Thy fathers went down into Egypt with three score and ten persons, and now the Lord thy God hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude." Duet. x.: 22. To which we may add Ex. i.: 1 & 5. It does seem strange that Colenso should quarrel with the statement, that, *sixty-six came* into Egypt, and yet find no fault with that one which says that *seventy* came! It is surely plain, that in *whatever sense* it can be said, that Ephraim and Manasseh came into Egypt, though they were born there; in the same sense it may be said of Hezron and Hamul, who may have been born in Egypt. This might be enough to answer the whole of Colenso's "assumptions." He admits that, in stating that the sons of Joseph *went* or *came* down into Egypt, *the writer's meaning is obvious enough.*"—(P. 72.) Yet, he would have us believe, that, the same statement applied to

Hezron and Hamul, who were, according to his "assumption," in the *same condition*, would be such a contradiction as to prove the "story" incredible!

Again: if Colenso had looked at his Hebrew Bible he would have noticed that the preposition "with" is not the *im* or *eth*, but the *le*,* and the literal rendering of Gen. XLVI.: 26 & 27 would then be as follows:

"All the souls of (or belonging to), Jacob that came into Egypt, who came out of his loins, besides the wives of the sons of Jacob, all the souls, three score and six, and the sons of Joseph which were born of him, in Egypt, two souls, all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, three score and ten."

The narrative does not say that they were all born before Jacob came to Egypt, or that they came *with* him; but that they "came out of his loins?" As to the expression "came into Egypt,"—it applies to the sons of Joseph as much as to the sons of Pharez, and "the meaning is obvious," as Colenso admits.

But there is a reason why Hezron and Hamul are put in the record in this list. Why is it said that "all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, were seventy? when it is evident there were others with these?" (e. g., Jacob's son's wives, and likely many servants.) Why does not Colenso peck at that expression? And why are Er and Onan mentioned at all; the *dead* among the *living*? Unquestionably, to show that the living took the place of the dead. Surely there were others that died in Canaan besides Er and Onan; but their places were not re-filled as theirs. We might expect, therefore, to find Hezron and Hamul by adoption, in the room of Er and Onan becoming the heads of tribal families, like Ephraim and Manasseh, who, in this way, became the progenitors of tribes. Turn to Num. XXVI.: 19 & 21, and there, after being again informed of the death of Er and Onan, we are told that they (Hezron and Hamul), were the progenitors of the tribal families that bear their names. Colenso asks why these two grand sons of Judah are mentioned in this list, when others are not. The answer is—because they had been adopted to fill up the place of the sons that died, and they gave rise to tribal families which others did not. The sacred historian does not profess to give a minute detail of *all* the events, and individuals concerned, but, like any other good historian, he notes those only that are important to the reader.

* As Hebrew types are uncommon, I shall use English letters.

It is scarcely worth while, now, to dispute the second "assumption," that Hezron and Hamul *must* have been born in Egypt. We may note, however, that it is by no means certain that Judah was only forty-two years old when he went down to Egypt. When he addressed Laban he did not say that he had been twenty years in Padanaram, but "This twenty years have I been *with thee*. And again: (Gen. xxxi: 41), "Thus have I been twenty years *in thy house*." He may have been longer in that region, though not in the house of Laban. If the events, in Gen. xxx., be in their chronological order—as Colenso seems to admit there must have been more than three years between the birth of Judah and that of Joseph—(within that time reckoning after Colenso's style), the following events must have occurred:—Leah, having given birth to Judah, "saw that she had left bearing." She could not, reasonably see that, in less than two years, then she gave to Jacob, Zilpah, who, in due time, gave birth first to Gad, and then to Asher; this would take at least two years more. Leah again conceived, and had the fifth son Issachar, and then the sixth, Zebulun, and "afterwards" (how long we know not), a daughter, Dinah, and then comes the birth of Joseph. That all these events could take place within three years is "impossible," and so falls Colenso's theory of Judah being three years older than Joseph. Judah was very likely more than fifty years old when he went down to Egypt; and Hezron and Hamul may, after all, have been born in Canaan; whether or not, there is nothing in this to cast a shadow of doubt upon the Sacred Record. It seems very presumptuous to bring forward such a frivolous and utterly groundless argument as the first of a series to prove that the Pentateuch is untrue. It is a well known logical axiom, that when a syllogism proves too much, it proves nothing at all; it becomes a reasoning *ad absurdum*. Would Colenso have us believe that even a writer of fiction would commit such a gross blunder, as he charges upon Moses? It is not likely that any man, with brains enough to write a book at all, would commit such an error as C. pretends to find in this portion.

Let any one study this very subject most closely, and compare Gen. xlii. with Num. xxvi., and he will be compelled to admit, that the undesigned coincidences and other internal evidences are overwhelming to prove that the Pentateuch is both true in its matter, and Divine in its origin.

CHAPTER III.

THE NUMBER OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL AT THE EXODUS.

Almost all the difficulties, which Colenso raises against the Pentateuch, depend upon one "assumption" or premise. By an arithmetical multiplying process, he sets down the number of all Israel, at the time of the Exodus, at two millions at least. Then he endeavors to prove that,—

1st. Moses could not have spoken to so many.

2nd. The area of the camp must have been so great, it would have been impossible to obey certain commands relating to cleanness, &c.

3rd. Tents could not have been provided for so many travellers.

4th. Arms could not have been furnished for so many warriors.

5th. Lambs and sheep sufficient for the passover could not have been pastured.

6th. It would imply an incredible number (42) in each family, or by every mother.

7th. It was impossible that they could have multiplied enough, during their sojourn in Egypt, to make up that number; and finally, for many other reasons, not here mentioned, there could not have been so many. Therefore, the Pentateuch is unhistorical (or rather), untrue. This is the grand design of every chapter. Every sentence is levelled against the Bible to make it appear unworthy of trust.

One would have thought that these reasonings and conclusions would have driven a logician to re-examine his premises, lest there might be an error there, before he would condemn the book. It does not seem that such a thought occurred to him at all. *One bias* only seems to have regulated every process, viz.: to dispose of the Old Bible, and relieve us from faith in the Pentateuch, which he says, could not possibly have been written by Moses, or any one acquainted with the facts, which it professes to describe. But what if it should turn out that his premises are false,—that there were no such numbers as Colenso, by his process, professes to prove?

It is true, indeed, that the most able expositors and commentators have generally set down the whole number of the Children of Israel, at the Exodus, as being from two to three millions; but it is clear that they did not enter into any minute examination of that subject; and it is not at all impossible that they may have been all mistaken, and, far more likely than that, the Pentateuch is unhistorical.

One thing is certain—the Bible *never* says that there were, at that time, two millions, or any number approaching it; and it would be strange if, notwithstanding the numerous and repeated statements of their numbers, their *real whole* number should never once appear.

I proceed, therefore, to examine the premises of Colenso's arguments: *

First, let us see how Colenso makes out that there were at the Exodus two millions of the Israelites. He says:—

"The men in the prime of life above twenty years of age, (Num. 1: 3, were six hundred thousand in number—we may reckon that the women in the prime of life, were about as many; the males under twenty years three hundred thousand; the females under twenty years three hundred thousand: and the old people, male and female together, two hundred thousand—making the whole number about two millions. This number, which Kurtz adopts, is, indeed, a very moderate estimate. Horne makes the number upwards of three millions."

This reckoning appears very reasonable. Given six hundred thousand men, in the prime of life, in any country, and we may reasonably expect a population of two millions.

But if there *were not* six hundred thousand men, in the prime of life, all the conclusions drawn from that premise fall to the ground. This "assumption," therefore, should have been clearly proved; nor should the critic be content with a mere translation, when the original Hebrew was at hand. It does not appear, that in all his researches, he ever gave this question a critical examination, though almost all his difficulties are based upon it. While he was endeavoring to overturn the doctrines of other commentators he followed them in this without investigation. But he is not the first foolish man who has built a house without a good foundation.

In our examination of the important question, concerning the number of the Israelites at the Exodus, we must proceed somewhat minutely; and, though we know that we have a great host of

* For much of the material that follows under this head, I am indebted to the Rev. J. B. Paton, of Sheffield, England, whose very able articles appeared in the *London Weekly Review*. I make this general acknowledgment, as I cannot conveniently put any portion under quotations. The arguments are chiefly my own—suggested by his.

eminent expositors against our view of the matter, we are at liberty to differ from them without any disrespect—for I do not believe that many of them thought it necessary to give that part of the subject a close examination. While we admire the able explanations of our fathers, we adore far more the Bible itself, and must be guided by it alone.

The first account of the number of the Children of Israel, at the Exodus, is found in Ex. xii. : 37, and in our English version reads thus:—"And the Children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand on foot *that were* men, beside children."

A very ordinary and unlearned reader would observe that this verse, in its present form, is not natural. The children are mentioned, and yet no women. They could not be all men and children. Again he will notice that the two words "*that were*" are not in the original—they are supplied, and, therefore, put in Italics. The preposition *on* is not in the original either, and is superfluous. Therefore, the proper rendering is,—“The Children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand footmen, beside children.”

The original expression for footmen is, *Ragli Haghebarim*. *Ragli* is a sort of adverb, and literally means *on foot*—from the verb *ragal* to foot it. *Ghebarim* is from the verb *Ghubar*, to be or become strong. The primary idea being to bind up; hence, it naturally signifies those who are strong, in maturity, in contrast with the young and feeble, and is in this text, therefore, contrasted with *children*. It is true that it is in the masculine gender, but grammarians know that in every language, when both sexes are included, the masculine form is preferred.

This signification is proved by comparing other Scriptures where the same word is translated *strong*.—1 Sam. xiv. : 52; 2 Kings, xxiv. : 16; Ecc. ix. : 11. The literal rendering is therefore, thus:—"The Children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand on foot—the strong—besides children." This is perfectly intelligible. The historian is not writing of *battles*, where men alone would be engaged—but of *journeyings* in which those who were able, *the strong*, had to go "on foot," and the weak, "the children," had to be carried. It is noticeable, too, that the word used for "children" (*taph*), means "little ones," who could not travel "on foot." By a remarkable and gracious Providence all those of matured age were hale, and able to go on foot, as we are informed—Ps. cv. : 3.

I think every Hebrew scholar will admit the accuracy of the rendering and meaning I have given of the text now considered; nor can I believe that it does not commend itself to any unlearned reader as the most rational, and common sense view.

Let us see how it agrees with other Scripture:—We learn that after the Israelites came into the wilderness, ungrateful for the miraculous provisions given, they lusted for the flesh pots of Egypt. Then Moses was distressed, and said:—Num. xi. : 13. “Whence should I have flesh to give unto all this people? for they weep unto me saying:—Give us flesh that we may eat.” The Lord in anger promised them flesh to eat, for a whole month, till it should “come out at their nostrils,” v. 20. “And Moses said:—The people among whom I *am*, are six hundred thousand footmen (ragli); and thou hast said, I will give them flesh, that they may eat a whole month. Shall the flocks and the herds be slain for them, to suffice them? or shall all the fish of the sea be gathered together for them, to suffice them?” v. 21 & 22. Surely no one can look at this passage, and suppose that Moses intended only to mention the number of the able-bodied men in Israel. They were not the only ones that needed flesh to eat. He magnifies the difficulty of providing flesh a whole month for so many. He does not say, “the *men*,” but “the *people*” among whom I am, and “whence should I have flesh to give unto *all this people* (Kol ha am). There can be no ambiguity about it. The whole text and context make it plain that he means what he says—“*All* this people.” The women, as well as the men, lusted for flesh; and it is utterly incredible that, in these circumstances, Moses would mention only a part of the people. I think this *one* text is sufficient to determine the number of Israel; and, unless I found some others incompatible with it, I could not doubt that the round numbers of the adults, male and female, are here stated.

There are several other means by which we could arrive at a probable computation of the number of Israel at the Exodus.

First, there is the fixed number of the first-born:—

“And the Lord said unto Moses,—number all the first-born of the males, of the Children of Israel, from a month old and upward, and take the number of their names.”—Num. iii. : 40. Who are meant by the first-born, is plain enough from the statement concerning them.—See verse 12, and elsewhere. “All the first-born that openeth the matrix among the Children of Israel.” The number of first-born must, therefore, be the same as the number of

mothers, and of families, save those whose first-born were under one month.

The number of males is stated at twenty-two thousand two hundred and seventy-three.—Num. iii.: 43. Allowing as many females we have the total, four hundred and forty-five thousand and forty-six.

Those who set down the total number of Israel at two millions, or more, say that twenty-two thousand two hundred and seventy-three, are not all the first-born males. That when a first-born became himself the head of a family, he was not numbered. This supposition, which has no Scripture to support it, is directly contradicted by the express statement:—"Number *all* the first-born of the males, from a month old *and upwards*." Again it is said that many of them would be destroyed under the order of Pharaoh; but this would be the case with the other males as well, and would not likely affect the proportions in any sensible degree.

It will be admitted however, that, since the first-born was the oldest in the family, there would be more of them dead than of their younger brethren. Taking this into account, together with those under a month old who were not numbered, we may very reasonably allow Colenso's estimate, and call the actual number of the first-borns sixty thousand. But if, as some say, the total number of Israel was over two millions, then every mother in Israel must have had, on an average, *thirty-three* children! which is incredible. Besides, it follows that there could not be more than one woman (child-bearing), to *ten* men, which is also incredible.

But we have shown already, that six hundred and three thousand five hundred and fifty was the total number of Israel, which, according to the census of the first-borns, would allow ten, on an average, to each family. This is not only credible, but very likely, when we look at the Divine promises to the patriarchs, that their seed should multiply as the stars of heaven. These facts, I think, prove clearly that we are right in maintaining that six hundred and three thousand five hundred and fifty was the whole number of the adults of Israel, and not a *fraction* only.

We, therefore, turn the Bishop's figures against him, and prove that it is *his* story that is incredible, and not the Pentateuch.

Secondly, there is another remarkable co-incidence which confirms this view of the subject. Moses was commanded to number the Levites in a manner precisely the same as the first-borns—"Every

male from a month old and upward."—Num. iii. : 15. We might expect that tribe to be nearly one-twelfth of the whole. No good reason can be shown why it should be much larger or much less than any of the others.

The number of males was twenty-two thousand; the same as that of the first-borns, less 213. Doubling that number, to allow as many females, we have forty-four thousand, somewhat less than a twelfth. This fact also very remarkably confirms what we have advanced about the relative proportions of the first-borns.

On looking at Num. i., we find the following are the numbers of the tribes:—

Reuben, 46,500 Judah, 74,600 Ephraim, 40,500 Dan, 62,700
Simeon, 59,300 Issachar, 54,400 Manasseh, 32,200 Asher, 41,500
Gad, 45,650 Zebulun, 57,400 Benjamin, 35,400 Naph, 53,100

If, as already stated, we allow forty-four thousand to represent the number of the tribe of Levi, it is proportional to that of the other tribes. There is just such a variety as we would expect; but if, as Colenso and some others say, the numbers of all the *other* tribes must be taken four-fold, how is it that the tribe of Levi is so small? It would be quite a contrast to any of the rest. Colenso says, that proves the Pentateuch unhistorical. We would say it proves *his promises false*.

There is yet another notable confirmation of what we have advanced:—

There was a tax laid upon Israel as an atonement.—Ex. xxx. : 12 & 16. "When thou takest the sum of the Children of Israel after their number, then shall they give every man (literally every one), a ransom for his soul unto the Lord, when thou numberest them; that there be no plague among them, when thou numberest them." As to the parties for whom it is to be given the command is plain—"every one," without limitation. Then follow instructions how it is to be collected—for it would be impossible to collect it from "every one" separately,—from women and children. "This they shall give, every one that passeth among them that are numbered;" the original is—*Khol ha-ghnover-al-hap-pe-Kudim*. The preposition *al* has the signification *for, on account of*.—(See Gesenius.) The exact rendering, therefore, would be, "This they shall give every one that passeth (*i. e.*, representative), on account (or on behalf), of those numbered, every one from twenty years old and upward." This defines the persons who are to pay, viz.:—Those from twenty years old and upward. They pay for the rest as stated—2 Kings xii. : 4, where the same tribute is

spoken of in these words:—"And Jehoshaphat said unto the priests—all the money of the dedicated things, that is brought into the house of the Lord, even the money of every one that passeth (ghnover), *the account*, the money that every one is set at;" (or, as in the margin, "the money of the souls of his estimation.")—See also Neh. x. : 32.

We have then only to find how much was paid for all Israel, at the rate of half a shekel each soul. It was 100 talents, 1775 shekels, Ex. xxxviii. : 23. "A bekah for every one, half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary, from every one that went to be numbered," (ha ghnover, every one on behalf of the numbered), "for six hundred thousand and three thousand and five hundred and fifty." If these renderings be correct, (and I think Hebrew scholars will admit they are), then it is certain the number of Israel was but a little over six hundred thousand, instead of two millions, and all Colenso's arithmetic only demonstrates *his rashness*, instead of proving the *Pentateuch unhistorical*.

There are yet two more texts, of great importance, bearing directly on this part of the subject.

"Take ye the sum of all the congregation of the Children of Israel, after their families, by the house of their fathers, with the number of their names, every male by their polls; from twenty years old and upward, all that are able to go forth to war in Israel."—Num. i. : 2.

Such was the order given to Moses. A careful perusal of which, will show, that a double census was required. The first, that of "all the congregation of Israel, after their families, by the house of their fathers, with the number of their names." The second, "every male by their polls; from twenty years old and upward, all that are able to go forth to war." The first has no limitation whatever; it is "the sum of all the congregation." The second has three, viz. : First males; second: "twenty years old and upward;" third: "able to go forth to war." This seems clear enough from the present rendering. It is well-known, however, that the Hebrew was originally written, not only without any pauses marked, but even without separation of the words. It is not strange, then, that mistakes might occur in putting in the pause, a slight change of which, will greatly alter the sense. Moreover, the Hebrew is very elliptical, as are all ancient languages.

I shall take the rendering given in an English review by an unknown writer—a translation which every scholar will pronounce literal and correct.

"Take the sum of all the congregation of Israel after their families, after the house of their fathers, by number. The names of every male by their polls, from twenty years old and upward, all who are able to march, note them down, thou and Aaron." This makes it plain. The whole congregation were to be numbered and the sum of them taken, according to their families. Not so those who were fit for military service. They were to be taken in a separate register by *their polls* without any regard to their families.

We must read the record of their numbers in the light of this commission. The full rendering of verse 20, in this chap. would then be—"The children of Reuben, Israel's eldest son, by their generations, after their families, by the house of their fathers, in their number (or sum) were numbered. And also the names by their polls of every male from twenty years old and upward; all that were able to go forth to war." Their number, that is, of the tribe of Reuben, "was forty and six thousand, and five hundred." The repetition of the name of the tribe shows that it is not the number of the "males by their polls," but that of the whole tribe that is recorded. The number of those fit for military service would be useful at the time, but could be of no great interest to future ages; and, therefore, did not need to be recorded.

This formula continues through the whole register. We never read of the number of the males, but "Those that were numbered of *them*, even of the tribe." Wherever a limit is made, it is specially stated, as in the case of the first-born and of the Levites. When the sum total is stated, it is in similar terms, v. 45-46. I shall give it literally, from the Hebrew now before me. "And the children of Israel by the house of their fathers were all numbered. And those from twenty years old and upward, all that were able to go forth in the hosts of Israel (were numbered.) And their whole number was six hundred thousand, and three thousand and five hundred and fifty."

The other texts to which I referred are in Num. xxvi. It is a well understood law, that when orders have once been issued, they need not be repeated in detail to the same person. This accounts for the brief manner in which the command to number the people is repeated in Chap. xxvi., v. 2. Take the sum of all the congregation of the Children of Israel. (Take the sum of those) from twenty years old and upward, throughout their father's house, all that are able to go to war in Israel. The meaning is quite plain, if we allow a full pause after the word "Israel," and that the verb is understood in the last clause.

The modifications which we have introduced, in the rendering of these texts, do no violence to the original; nor do they make a *great* change on our English translation—the excellency of which is almost superhuman. Yet, no one will say it is absolutely perfect.

I have examined somewhat minutely this subject, and if I have made it clear,—that the sum of *all* Israel was only a little more than six hundred thousand, instead of two millions, then the most of all Colenso's wild conclusions are turned upside down. This view, while it harmonizes many seeming difficulties, does not come in collision with any statement whatever, in the Old Testament or *New*, nor anything known in history, sacred or profane.

The above will be a complete answer to many, if not most, of the difficulties which Colenso has sought to put against the Scriptures. We shall not, therefore, in our further remarks, follow his divisions in their order, but rather take up first those chapters which are most affected by what we have advanced in this one.

CHAPTER IV.

THE NUMBER OF THE FIRST-BORNS COMPARED WITH THE NUMBER OF MALE ADULTS.

Colenso, in dealing with this subject, quotes from Num. iii. : 43, as follows:—

“And the first-born males, from a month old and upwards, of those that were numbered, were twenty and two thousand two hundred and three score and thirteen.”

This is not correctly quoted, but let that pass. He says:—

“Let us see what this statement implies when treated as a simple matter of fact. For this purpose I quote the words of Kurtz. “If there were six hundred thousand males of twenty years and upwards, the whole number of males may be reckoned at nine hundred thousand, (he elsewhere reckons one million), in which case there would be only *one* first-born to forty two (forty-four), males. In other words, the number of boys in every family must have been, on the average, *forty two*.”

The Bishop seems to think the above good reasoning. He observes correctly, that, taking into account that half of the first-borns may have been daughters, we must then double the number of the whole people, and hence, every mother must have

bad, on the average, forty-two children. He allows, however, that a greater number of the first-borns, than of the others, might be dead, and sets down sixty thousand as perhaps the true proportion. Still this implies about thirty-three children, on an average, to every mother, and only one wife, with family, to ten men! His usual conclusion, of course is, that the Pentateuch is "unhistorical."

We have disposed of this so called difficulty in the previous chapter. But the reader would, no doubt, like to know how some others endeavor to explain it.

Some think the primo-genitus or first-born was reckoned only when he was the first from both parents. This would only affect the proportion if polygamy was common. There is no evidence of this, rather the contrary, besides the definition of the first-born, ("all that openeth the matrix," applied to man and beast—Num. xviii. : 15), clearly forbids that theory. On that supposition, how could the first-borns be more numerous than the whole tribe of Levi? Others think that those first-borns, who had become heads of families, were not counted in the number. But the order says: "From a month old and upward," and is applied to the Levites as well. Scott thinks those only were reckoned who were born after they left Egypt; that the order was not retrospective, but prospective only. This theory cannot be admitted at all, for it makes the difficulty, at least, as great on the other side. How could there be so many? and again the directions forbid it, "from a month old and upward;" and, finally, how could there be, in such a short time, as many first-borns as the whole tribe of Levi?

The true explanation, I think, has already been given, viz. : that there is no Scripture for saying there were then two millions of Israel. They were only six hundred and three thousand five hundred and fifty. Allowing, as we think every reasonable man will, that there may have been sixty thousand first-borns, male and female, including some of those in that generation dead, then every family, on an average, would contain about ten children. This is not only credible, but very likely, and is in harmony with the promises, and other statements.—"The Children of Israel were fruitful, and increased abundantly, and multiplied." "The more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied." Ex. i. : 7 & 12.

In looking at the words which Colenso omitted in the quotation, I think we find a confirmation of what was stated in the last chapter :
 "All the first-born males, *by the number of their names*, from a month old and upward, of those that were numbered of them, &c."

How particular the writer is in defining that they were numbered "by their names," *i. e.*, individually, and repeating that the number was taken "*of them*," signifying who were included, and who were excluded.

Instead of proving the Pentateuch unhistorical, the matter here referred to, discloses a remarkable evidence of the accuracy of the Bible, and rightly studied, conveys most solemn lessons to the reader. There is a "general assembly, and church of the *first-born*," into which we must come.

CHAPTER V.

THE SOJOURNING OF THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL IN EGYPT.

"Now the sojourning of the Children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years."—Ex. xii. : 40.

The matter of this 15th Chapter, by Colenso, is preparatory to a fresh attack upon the Pentateuch. I am not disposed to dispute his positions under this heading. His question is, whether the four hundred and thirty years here spoken of, were spent in Egypt alone, or there and elsewhere. He insists on the latter, but tries to have a fling at the Scripture form of expressing it. He says:—"There is evidently something unusual and awkward in the manner in which the phrase "who dwelt in Egypt," enters into the above passage."

To me it appears to have a peculiar fitness and beauty. All admit that their longest sojourn was in Egypt. It is expressive of their condition as, "strangers in a strange land," and brings their sojourning to a close; contrasting it with the deliverance which followed, which is immediately introduced in these words—v. 41 : "And it came to pass at the end of four hundred and thirty years, even the self-same day it came to pass, that all the hosts of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt."

Referring to Heb. xi. : 9, and Gal. iii. : 17, Colenso thinks it is clear that the sojourning of Abraham and his seed is included in the four hundred and thirty years. I think so too. Indeed, any other view would introduce insurmountable difficulties.

It is remarkable that Colenso adopts in this chapter the principle he rejected in Chapter II., viz. : that the Scriptures speak of parents and children as one; and say of one what is strictly true

only of the other. e.g.—The promise is given to Jacob—Gen. XLVI. : 4. “I will go down with thee into Egypt; and I will also *surely bring thee up again.*” This principle of hermeneutics suited his findings *here* It was all against him *there* and that made a difference.

CHAPTER VI.

THE EXODUS OF ISRAEL IN THE FOURTH GENERATION.

The object of this Chapter in Colenso's book, like the former is preparatory, and is designed to form part of the proof that the number of Israel could not be as great as the Pentateuch affirms.

I am convinced that many have wasted labor, in striving to confute the arguments of this chapter, and the former, of Colenso's book.

Green tries to show that “a generation,” in the Pentateuch, means a century; but his arguments, I think, entirely fail of proof. That conclusion, indeed, would involve far greater difficulties than those he seeks to avoid.

That Israel did come up in the fourth generation, after their descent into Egypt, seems to me perfectly harmonious with all the facts stated in the Bible. The texts quoted, however, do not absolutely say that they came in the fourth generation. Here they are:—“And he said unto Abraham, know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not their's, and shall serve them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years; And also that nation whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterward shall they come out with great substance; and thou shalt go to thy fathers in a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again, for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.”—Gen. xv. : 13 & 16.

It is not said that the posterity of Abraham shall come back in the fourth generation, from their *descent into Egypt*. Nothing is said about Egypt at all. He is informed that his seed shall be a stranger in a land not their own—that they shall be afflicted, it is not said by whom—the time of their affliction—the judgment upon “that nation,” evidently referring to a particular one—their triumphant Exodus—the decease of Abraham himself—and their return in the fourth generation. It is not definitely stated from

what date the four generations are to be reckoned; Colenso thinks it must be from the descent into Egypt. It may be so. It would seem to refer to the time of their affliction in "that nation," distinct from the four hundred years. I shall accept that interpretation.

The manner in which the Bishop proceeds to prove that Israel did come out of Egypt, in the fourth generation, after their descent is certainly curious. He presents it in the following table :

1 Gen.	2 Gen.	3 Gen.	4 Gen.	5 Gen.	
Levi,	Kohath,	Amram,	Moses,		Ex. vi.: 16, 18 & 20
Levi,	Kohath,	Amram,	Aaron,		
Levi,	Kohath,	Uzziel,	Elzaphan,		Leo. x.: 4
Pharez,	Hezron,	Ram,	Amminidab,	Nashon,	Ruth iv.: 18 & 19
Pharez,	Hezron,	Segub,	Jair,		1 Chron. ii.: 21 & 22
Pharez,	Hezron,	Caleb,	Hur,	Uri, Bezaleel,	do 18 & 20

I have omitted a few names as unimportant. He says :—

"In the last instance Bezaleel is in the fifth generation from Pharez; perhaps he was a young man, and reckoned in the generation next to that of Joshua." "Besides, Hezron, as well as his father Pharez, was born, according to the story, in the Land of Canaan; so that Bezaleel was actually, still in the fourth generation from one who went down into Egypt."

One would think that his own demonstration would convince this logician that he can prove nothing upon his principle; for, according to his own table, he has them all in the *third* generation, save three—two of them are in the fourth, and one in the fifth. In his table he has given eleven cases—only two of which are in the fourth generation. He puts Uri in the fourth generation, and then tries to prove that his son Bezaleel is in the fourth! He tried to prove that Hezron could not have been among those that went down into Egypt; and now he has the effrontery to assume that he did!

Did ever anybody see such a style of chronology as this? Just look at it! It seems we may count from the son Levi! or from the grandson Pharez!! or from the great grandson Hezron!!! at any rate we will make out four generations!

But did not Jacob, himself, go down into Egypt? and from him even Moses might be put in the fifth generation and Bezaleel would be in the eighth.

There is a text that is rather troublesome to the Bishop, and threatens to overturn all his theory; hence, he turns upon it a fierce attack. He says :—

"In 1 Chron. vii.: 22 & 27, we have a remarkable exception to the above rule, where we find the genealogy of Joshua given as

follows :—"Joshua, the son of Nun, the son of Elishama, the son of Ammihud, the son of Laadan, the son of Tahan, the son of Telah, the son of Rephah, the son of Beriah, the son of Ephraim, that is to say, Joshua is given in the ninth generation from Ephraim, and the tenth from Joseph."

Well, how will he get rid of this witness against him? In accordance with former practice, he might count from some great grandson, and so make out four generations. He does not; but hear him. He says:—"We are not concerned with the books of Chronicles, but with the narrative in the Pentateuch itself." If a witness comes into court, that is likely to damage your case, just turn him out. But Colenso evidently fears that this witness may be dangerous even after he is turned out; and, therefore, he tries to kill him thus. He says:—

"But, in truth, the account of Joshua's descent in 1 Chron. vii., involves a palpable contradiction. Thus we are told that Ephraim's *daughter* built two villages in the Land of Canaan. If we suppose this to mean that the *descendants* of Ephraim's daughter, after the conquest in the time of Joshua, did this, yet in verse 22 & 23: we have this most astonishing fact stated,—that Ephraim himself, after the slaughter by the men of Gath of his descendants in the *seventh* generation, "mourned many days," and then married again, and had a son Beriah, who was the *ancestor of Joshua!* This Beriah, however, is not named at all among the sons of Ephraim in the list given in Num. xxvi.: 35."

In order to show how heedlessly the Bishop reads his Bible, and commits the most egregious blunders in his interpretation of it. I shall give the verses referred to:—

"And the sons of Ephraim, Shuthelah, and Bered his son, and Tahath his son, and Eladah his son, and Tahath his son, and Zabab his son, and Shuthelah his son, and Ezer and Elead, whom the men of Gath that were born in that land slew, because they came down to take away their cattle; and Ephraim, their father, mourned many days, and his brethren came to comfort him; and when he went in unto his wife she conceived, and bare a son, and he called his name Beriah, because it went evil with his house. (And his daughter was Sherah, who built Bethoron, the nether, and the upper, and Uzzan—Sherah.)"

Colenso puts Ezer and Elead along with Shuthelah the second, as the sons of Zabab, and in the *seventh generation* from Ephraim; but the connective "*and*" joins them immediately with Shuthelah, the *first*, whose descendants are parenthetically given. Ezer and Elead are, therefore, the sons of *Ephraim himself*, who is distinctly called *THEIR FATHER*. It is not strange that he would mourn for his own sons, and have another one after. There is no mention of his marrying again. The building of Bethoron, by the daughter of Ephraim, was, doubtless, in her life time and his; and

what is there incredible about that? Surely, if he had read these verses a second time, he would not have so exposed his recklessness and trifling with the Scriptures. His error on these texts was pointed out to him by others, but he evidently did not understand them.

He observes, moreover, that Elishama, the grandson of Joshua, (Num. xi. : 18, and Ex. xvii. : 8 & 16), and Joshua himself were in active service nearly at the same time—"which also is hardly credible." Why so? Is not the prime minister of England, at this date, four score years of age?—his duties are very arduous. He might well have a grandson able to command an army. But in these days a man could be found a hundred and twenty years old—"his eyes not dim, nor his natural force abated."

It seems to me evident, that, during the stay of Israel in Egypt, from five to ten generations arose; and yet it could, with perfect accuracy be said, that in the fourth generation (from their descent), they came hither (to the Land of Canaan), again, if there were even two, (and there were doubtless many), in that generation. This is in accordance with the *usus loquendi* of both ancient and modern times. Thus we are told that Job lived to see "his sons' sons even *four* generations.—Job xlii. : 15." Any one would say that a people who went to a foreign land, returned in the fourth generation, though there were not more than two of them in that rank. The design is evidently to state how many generations absolutely passed away before their return—but a generation has not passed while one of them is left. This is, in fact, the only way such an utterance can be understood, to have any definite meaning at all; for when it was said, "In the fourth generation they shall come hither again," no man in his senses would suppose they would be *all* in the fourth generation. Many might be in the tenth, while some of the fourth yet lived.

The object of Colenso in the two chapters last examined is plain from the following paragraph. He says:—

"From this it can be shown, beyond a doubt, that it is quite impossible that there should have been such a number of the people of Israel in Egypt, at the time of the Exodus, as to have furnished six hundred thousand warriors in the prime of life, representing, at least, two millions of persons, of all ages and sexes—that is to say it is impossible, if we will take the data to be derived from the Pentateuch itself."

To this I would answer first, that the *Bible never says* there were so many warriors in the prime of life; second, we are prepared to show, that it is by no means *impossible* if it *had said so*, and shall do so in the chapter following.

CHAPTER VII.

THE NUMBER OF ISRAEL AT THE TIME OF THE EXODUS.

I shall first give the substance of Colenso's arguments and conclusions. He says:—

"In the first place, it must be observed, as already noted, that we nowhere read of any *very large families* among the Children of Jacob, or their descendants to the time of the Exodus. We may suppose, in order that we may have the population as large as possible, that very few died prematurely, and that those who were born almost all lived and multiplied. But we have no reason whatever, from the data furnished by the sacred books themselves, to assume that they had families materially larger than those of the present day. Thus we are told in Gen. xlv., that Reuben had four sons, Simeon six, Levi three, Judah five, Issachar four, Zebulun three, Gad seven, Asher four, Joseph two, Benjamin ten, Dan one, Naphtali four. It is strange that, among all the sixty-nine children, and grand children, and great grand children of Jacob, who went down with him into Egypt, there should be only *one* daughter mentioned, and *one* grand daughter. The very numbering of these two among the seventy souls shows that the females out of the loins of Jacob were not omitted *intentionally*.

The twelve sons of Jacob, then, as appears from the above, had between them fifty-three sons, that is, on the average, four and a half each. Let us suppose that they increased in this way from generation to generation. Then, in the *first* generation, that of Kohath, there would be fifty-four males—(according to the story, fifty-three, or only fifty-one, since Er and Onan died in the Land of Canaan, v. 12, without issue)—in the *second*, that of Amram, two hundred and forty-three; in the *third*, that of Moses and Aaron, one thousand and ninety-four; and in the fourth, that of Joshua and Eleazar, four thousand nine hundred and twenty-three—that is to say, instead of six hundred thousand warriors in the prime of life, there could not have been five thousand."

He proposes to add to these *all* the males in all the generations, and the number of the *fifth*, twenty-two thousand one hundred and fifty-four, "who would be mostly children," and adds "the sum total of males of all generations could not, according to these data, have exceeded twenty-eight thousand four hundred and sixty-five, instead of being one million."

According to Colenso's estimate the Children of Israel sojourned in Egypt not less than two hundred and ten years. If there were, as he affirms, only four generations, (the fifth being children), every man must have been about *fifty years* old before he married! All the above reasoning assumes that.

Again he has the presumption to put Joshua in the fifth generation, though by his own admission, the Scriptures put him in the tenth. Farther, he says we do not read of large families among the children of Jacob, and takes the number of those in the families at the time of the emigration, assuming that they were complete, and not a soul of that generation was born in Egypt. Did these young wives of Jacob's sons cease to bear when they went to Egypt? There is good reason to believe that those enumerated were young, and most likely many were added to them after their emigration. For anything said in the Pentateuch their number may have been more than doubled. Colenso, indeed, labored to prove that *some of them* must have been born in Egypt.

He may say as before, that, "we do not read" of any being born to them in Egypt. Then I suppose we shall have to conclude that many were *not born at all*—since we "do not read" of their birth. The same observations apply to his statements about daughters; according to his logic, we only read of *two* women—a daughter and grand-daughter—among Jacob's posterity when they went down to Egypt; therefore, there were no more—that is sixty-seven males, and only two females; therefore, the books are unhistorical! This is strange logic.

In answer to another writer he says, "the Scriptures imply no great fecundity among the Hebrews;" and above, "we do not read of large families." He refers to Ex. 1.: let him put on his spectacles, and see if he *can* read, for it is plainly printed, v. 7: "The Children of Israel were fruitful, and increased abundantly, and waxed exceeding mighty; and the land was filled with them." Bishop Colenso says they could not be expected to multiply fast, because they were oppressed; but see v. 12: "The more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew." If any language can express very great fecundity it is here.

The Hebrew verb *Pharatz*, here translated multiply, literally means to swarm like fish, and is so applied.—Gen. 1.: 20.

Let us see, then, what would be "credible," in regard to the increase of Israel. It is certain that Egypt has always been famous for the fecundity of its inhabitants, apart from any Divine interposition, such as was promised to Israel.

There were, doubtless, others went down with Israel to Egypt besides those mentioned, but we shall not reckon them. We shall also strike off ten from the number, and suppose they might be old—past progenitive age. Then, whether there were women among those that went down or not, these sixty men must have got wives

somewhere, so that we begin with *sixty families*. Suppose that they generally married about twenty-one, then about ten generations would arise. At least this is not "incredible." (Joshua was about that rank.) Then, by comparison of the number of first-borns, we found the ratio of increase to be about ten children, on an average, to each family. This would not be extraordinary in a people that "multiplied or swarmed exceedingly." Then we have just to multiply sixty by ten, nine times, dividing the product in each case by two, to form them (*i. e.* each generation), into families; and what is the result? Instead of *two millions* we have *two hundred and thirty four million three hundred and seventy five thousand*—and that number would only represent *one* generation, while most of four would, doubtless, be living at the same time, the younger being children.

These figures are enormous; yet, no one will say that any part of this supposition is in any degree "incredible."

But suppose a generation should arise only in thirty years, then there would be seven from the immigration to the Exodus. The last alone would be eighteen millions seven hundred and fifty thousand—allowing the parents and grand-parents to represent such as had died. Or, if we allow only *six* generations, there would be over three millions. In any case we cannot say that the numbers stated, as having sprung from sixty families in two hundred and ten years, are in the least degree unlikely. In the light of the promises, and facts stated concerning them, we might have expected larger numbers than those given. Thus vanishes the "impossibility" and "incredibility" which it seems floated in the cranium of the Bishop of Natal; in the Divine Scriptures—nowhere.

CHAPTER VIII,

THE DANITES AND LEVITES AT THE TIME OF THE EXODUS.

The "impossibilities" and "incredibilities" which Colenso tries to bring forward under this head are similar to those in the preceding. He says:—

"Dan, in the first generation, has *one* son Hushim—Gen. xlv. : 23; that he had no more born to him in the Land of Egypt, and, therefore, had *only* one son, appears from Num. xxvi. : 42, where the sons of Dan consist of only one family. Hence we may reckon that in the fourth generation he would have had twenty-seven warriors descended from him, instead of sixty-two

thousand seven hundred, as they are numbered in Num. ii. : 26, increased to sixty-four thousand and four hundred, in Num. xxvi. : 43. In order to have had this number born to him, we must suppose that Dan's one son, and each of *his* sons and grand-sons must have had about eighty children of both sexes. We may observe, also, that the offspring of the *one* son of Dan, sixty-two thousand seven hundred, is represented as nearly double that of the *ten* sons of Benjamin, thirty-five thousand and four hundred.—Num. ii. : 23."

McCaul in his able pamphlet observes, justly, "He (Colenso), thinks it is utterly incredible that any man could have forty sons; yet, Ahab had seventy sons; Ahaziah, King of Judah, had forty brothers; Gideon had seventy sons; Jair had thirty; Ibzan had thirty; Abdon had forty." The Bishop would have us believe that only three generations could have arisen in more than two centuries. That is absurd—one only in every seventy years, according to his arithmetic.

He insists, also, that no more were born to Dan in Egypt, because no more are mentioned in the families. The same remark would apply to all the others, so that the wives of Jacob's sons must have all left off bearing as soon as they left for Egypt: but let that pass. Might not this same Hushim, son of Dan, have had *say* ten sons; each of these might bring up a family of *say* ten or twelve. At this rate, before the Exodus in the seventh generation, (i.e., at the rate of one generation in thirty years), the children of Dan would have been three hundred and twelve thousand and five hundred—more than half the number of all Israel! Yet, Colenso thinks it impossible that there could be one fifth of that number.

Nor is it singular that the offspring of the *one* son of Dan should be double that of the *ten* sons of Benjamin. It is just such a result as very commonly happens, and marks the narrative as having the stamp of true history. A fictitious writer would never have thought of putting in such as that, without at least giving some explanation of it; but it needs none.

The children of the Danites might be mostly males; those of Benjamin mostly females, which would increase the one, and retard the other, the offspring being reckoned to the male parent of course.

"The number of the Levites," says Colenso, "at the second census, compared with that of the first, involves a great inconsistency. At the second, they number twenty-three thousand, all males from a month old and upward; at the first twenty-two thousand. Hence, during thirty-eight years in the wilderness, they had only increased one thousand. He says the Levites were

not numbered with the Israelites, and were not included in the sentence against them, for Eleazar, the son of Aaron, was ministering in the priest's office at Sinai, and was alive after the death of Joshua."—Num. xxvi. : 52 & 65.

Let us turn to that text, and we find Eleazar, with Moses, numbered the people. Concerning those that they *numbered*, it is said, "There was not a man of *them whom Moses*, and Aaron, the priest, *numbered*, when they numbered the Children of Israel in the wilderness of Sinai." But Eleazar, like Moses, was *not* among the numbered. He did the numbering. Colenso might as well count a father among his sons. There is no reason to suppose that the Levites were exempted from the sentence which was declared against the whole congregation, of which they were certainly a part. Other so called difficulties, referred to, in this chapter, are too childish to call for any attention. Indeed, they are already refuted in the above.

CHAPTER IX.

THE SIZE OF THE COURT OF THE TABERNACLE COMPARED WITH THE NUMBER OF THE CONGREGATION.

I now come to take account of some of the difficulties raised by Colenso, which are not so directly affected by our first chapters. They will be found mostly to be errors of interpretation, which is often too literal. Such incredibilities would be found almost in any book that ever was written.

"And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, "gather thou all the congregation together unto the door of the tabernacle, and Moses did as Jehovah commanded him."—Lev. viii. : 4.

Colenso says that "all the congregation" means "the whole body of the people. At all events, the adult males in the prime of life;" that they, coming to the door of the tabernacle, must have come *within the court*; that the width of the tabernacle was ten cubits or eighteen feet, and nine men could have stood in front of it. The whole congregation would have formed a column twenty miles long. The court could only have contained five thousand people; therefore, such a command never could have been uttered by Jehovah, and the Pentateuch is consequently "unhistorical."

We will agree with him that such a *command as he says* never could have been spoken by Jehovah. Nay more; by whom could such a statement ever have been made or recorded? Well says McCaul: "Does Colenso think Moses was a fool, or wrote for a nation of fools?"

I would observe, *firstly*, that "all the congregation" seldom, if ever, means every individual in Israel. The Bishop claims, at first, that this is the proper meaning of the phrase, but finds himself forced to admit a modification of it and allows that it may mean "the adult males in the prime of life." Where does he find that? He quotes a text referring to the passover. (Ex. xii. : 6), "The whole assembly of the congregation shall kill it in the evening." A most unfortunate text for his object; for in the verses preceding we are told that the *heads of the families* were to do this: "Every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for a house; and if the household be too little for the lamb, let him, and his neighbor next unto him, take it according to the number of the souls."

In verse third of this chapter an order is given thus: "Speak ye *unto all the congregation* saying,"—in verse 21 we are informed how that order was fulfilled: "Then Moses called for *all the elders* of Israel, and said unto them: draw out, and take you a lamb, according to your families, and kill the passover." The elders are called as representing the whole congregation; and *they* are addressed as if all the congregation were present. Moses does not say, "all the families," but "draw out, and take you a lamb according to your families." Will Colenso say that Moses did not understand the order given him, or did not properly obey it? These texts are enough to prove that *every one* of the people were not expected nor required to come into the court of the tabernacle.

But we observe, *secondly*,—there is not a word about the people coming within the court of the tabernacle—that is a fancy of the Bishop himself,—“a pure assumption unwarranted by any thing” in the text. "The assembly was gathered together *unto the door* of the tabernacle of the congregation."

The door of the tabernacle was the *whole end of it*—(Colenso seems to be ignorant of that.) It was called "the tabernacle of the congregation," not because of the people congregating there, but because the Lord did there meet with Moses as their representative.—Ex. xxv. : 22.

When the people were called to hear the word of the Lord, the assembly was a unit. However far it might extend, if the

edge of it touched the door of the tabernacle, a correct historian would describe it as called unto the door of the tabernacle. The original preposition, (El.) translated, *unto*, literally means, *verging towards*.—(See Gesenius.)

Why did not Colenso prefer such a text as Num. x. : 3: "All the assembly shall assemble themselves to (El.) thee?" and having proved that "only one full-grown man" could stand in front of Moses, then the assembly must have reached one hundred and eighty miles, &c. This would be exactly his process of reasoning, and could have raised a greater incredibility than the passage he has chosen.

If some Colenso takes up the *Globe* newspaper, a few centuries hence, and reads that Mr. Brown called the citizens of Toronto to the St. Lawrence Hall, and addressed them there, he will soon make out that newspaper "unhistorical." He could show that the population of Toronto was, at that time, fifty thousand—that they would have filled the Hall, and all the streets, for miles, &c., &c.

CHAPTER IX.

MOSES AND JOSHUA ADDRESSING ALL ISRAEL.

"These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel." Deut. i. : 1.

"And Moses called all Israel, and said unto them." Deut. v. : 1.

"And afterward he read all the words of the law, the blessings, and cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the law. There was not a word of all that Moses commanded which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel, with the women, and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them."—Joshua xii. : 34 & 35.

Colenso, as before, puts down the whole number of Israel at two millions, and proceeds to reason as follows:—

"How then is it conceivable that a man should do what Joshua is here said to have done, unless, indeed, the reading every word of all that Moses commanded, the blessings and the cursings was a mere dumb show, without the least idea of those most solemn words being heard by those to whom they were addressed; for, surely no human voice, unless strengthened by a miracle, of which the Scripture tells us nothing, could have reached the ears of a crowded mass of people as large as the whole population of London.

Nor can it be supposed that he read them first to one party, and then to another, till all the congregation had heard them. The day would not have sufficed, especially, after he had been already engaged, as the story implies, on the very same day in writing a copy of the law of Moses."

Upon this piece of logic I remark:—

Firstly,—the story implies no such thing as that Joshua wrote and read the law the *same day*. As well might this critic say he did all the acts of his life in one day, because they are written in one book. It is stated that, "he wrote there upon the stones a copy of the law of Moses," v. 32, "and *afterward* he read," v. 34. How long *afterward* is not stated. It may have been a month. The term seems to imply an interval of some time at least.

Secondly,—it is not said that the people *all heard* every word that was said. Joshua read *before* all the congregation, nor would it be a dumb show though many did not hear.

Thirdly,—had Colenso read with more discrimination he would have learned that Joshua was not *alone* in reading, for Moses had given command how this reading was to be done:—"These shall stand upon mount Gerizim to bless, and these shall stand upon mount Ebal to curse; and *the Levites shall speak*, and say unto all the men of Israel with *a loud voice*, &c."—Deut. xxvii. : 12-14. Joshua would stand before all the congregation, like a chief captain, and read slowly, while the Levites, as inferior officers, would stand at proper distances, and repeat it with a "loud voice." The people would thus have time to digest the solemn truths, and say Amen.

Fourthly,—we have shown already that there were not so many people as Colenso estimates, &c.

Fifthly,—though we have shown that the Levites likely read the law to the people, there is no reason for supposing that they could not all hear the voice of one man. Those who have been on the spot are better fitted to judge of the acoustics of that remarkable vale. Dr. Thomson thus writes:—

"Imagine that the lofty range of mountains running north and south was cleft open to its base by some tremendous convulsion of nature, at right angles to its own line of extension, and the broad fissure thus made is the vale of Nablous. Mount Ebal is on the north, Gerizim on the south, and the city between. Near the eastern end the vale is not more than sixty rods wide, and just here, I suppose, the tribes assembled to hear "the blessings and the cursings" read by the Levites. I have shouted to hear the echo, and then fancied how it must have been when the loud-voiced Levites, proclaimed from the naked cliffs of Ebal:—"Cursed be the man who maketh a graven image, an abomination to

Jehovah;" and then the tremendous "AMEN," ten-fold louder from the mighty congregation, rising and swelling from Ebal to Gerizim, and from Gerizim to Ebal."

Dr. Bonar also states that "it is quite a common thing for villagers to call to each other from the opposite hills, and that the voice is heard quite distinctly."

It is remarkable that modern travellers, who have examined the ground, thus report notable facts which corroborate the statements of these sublime passages of holy writ.

Colenso is evidently ignorant of two things: first, the proper meaning of the texts themselves; and second, the peculiar form of the grounds to which they refer.

CHAPTER X.

THE EXTENT OF THE CAMP COMPARED WITH THE PRIEST'S DUTIES, AND THE DAILY NECESSITIES OF THE PEOPLE.

"And the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh with his head, and with his legs, and his inwards, and his dung, even the whole bullock shall he (the priest), carry forth without the camp unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn him on the wood with fire; where the ashes are poured out shall he be burnt." Lev. iv.: 11-12.

Colenso states that a camp of more than two millions of people would occupy an area of more than a mile and a half across, in each direction, with the tabernacle in the centre; so that the priest would have to carry the refuse of the sacrifices *three quarters of a mile*.

But, he adds, "this would be an excessively cramped area for such a multitude." He, therefore, takes Scott's estimate of *twelve miles square*, and says:—

"We have to imagine the priest having, himself to carry, on his back, on foot, from St. Paul's to the out-skirts of the metropolis, the skin, and flesh, and head, and legs, and inwards, and dung, even the whole bullock; and the people having to carry out their rubbish in like manner, and bring in their supplies of water and fuel—after first cutting down the latter where they could find it."

Further, we have to imagine half a million of men going out daily—the twenty-two thousand Levites, for a distance of *six miles*—to the suburbs for the necessities of nature! The supposition involves, of course, an absurdity. But it is our duty to look plain facts in the face."

I think we may safely agree with the Bishop for once, that the "supposition" involves an absurdity. Did it not occur to him that it was therefore absurd to *suppose* it? for in the Bible it has no place.

Firstly,—the Scriptures say not a word about the priest carrying the refuse of the sacrifices *himself*; nor anybody else carrying them "*on back on foot*." All this is found only in Colenso's sneering supposition. The common English version does not say that the priest must carry the ofal *himself*. The Hebrew is yet more pointed. Had he read it in the original he would have found the verb *Yatza*, to go out, in the Hiphil form—*Hotzi, he shall cause to go out*. The thing was done by order of the priest. In common language, one is said to do that, which he caused to be done. Besides, none would need to carry the refuse on his back, since they had beasts of burden to bear it for them. No unbiased reader would think of such a ridiculous sense in such a phrase.

Did Jacob carry away all his cattle "*on his back on foot*" from Padanaram to Canaan?—Gen. xxxi. : 18. Did Shalamanezer carry all Israel "*on his back, on foot*," from Canaan to Halah and Habor?—2 Kings xvii. : 6. Or would Colenso say that the authors of these books meant to say so?

Secondly,—had Colenso known or thought about the manner of encampment, he would never have dreamed of one continuous camp "*twelve miles square*." Such a camp would likely be, in its order, about as much confused as the Bishop's brains seem to have been when he wrote about it.

Common sense would suggest that such a multitude of people would encamp in divisions according to convenience.

Accordingly, by turning to Num. ii., it will be found that there were *five camps*, with their ensigns, four of them *far off* about the tabernacle—*i. e.*, on the east, south, west, and north sides of the tabernacle, which was in the camp of the Levites in the centre. The priests would, therefore, have to perform the hard task of *sending* the ofal of the sacrifices beyond *one tent*—that of Moses and Aaron, which alone was in front of the tabernacle, iii. 38. The fuel and water, I suppose, the people would collect where they could find, within or without the camp. The "*necessities of nature*," to which this dignitary refers with ridicule, were subjected to such sanitary laws as govern a well-ordered city corporation. Let Christians note how their piety should be adorned with outward cleanliness and order, which have something to do in commending their religion to the world.

It is sad to notice how such men as Colenso make merry over these Divine teachings—"sporting themselves with their own deceivings."

CHAPTER XI.

THE NUMBER OF THE PEOPLE AT THE FIRST MUSTER, COMPARED WITH THE POLL-TAX RAISED SIX MONTHS PREVIOUSLY.

In Ex. xxx. : 11-13 we read that Moses was directed to "take the sum of the Children of Israel after their number;" and that they were to give a poll-tax of "half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary."

Colenso maintains that this phraseology "could hardly have been used in this way, until there was a sanctuary in existence, or rather, until the sanctuary had been *some time* in existence, and such a phrase had become *familiar* in the mouths of the people."

We remark *first*,—that he has excluded from his quotation an important part of the text. After introducing the phrase here for the first time, the sacred historian defines it: "A shekel is twenty gerahs." What could be more natural than this? Whether there were a sanctuary or no, the measure is introduced, and its capacity defined, that then, and ever after, it would be understood.

Secondly,—does Colenso mean to say that Israel had no manner of worship among them till the tabernacle was built? if they had, surely *shekel, ha-kodesh*, (literally holy shekel), would have as much meaning before, as after the construction of the sanctuary or tabernacle.

Thirdly,—the contributions for the tabernacle itself would call for the use of this measure, by which they would be guided in providing for its erection. It must therefore have been introduced before the tabernacle was built; nor could it become "familiar" till it was introduced.

But the chief difficulty, he says, is, that the number of the people (six hundred and three thousand five hundred and fifty), was identically the same [on the first occasion of numbering,—Num. xxx. : 11-12], as it was half a year afterwards.—Num. i. : 1-46. He "supposes" that on the first occasion, when the people were numbered they were taxed, and on the second when they were taxed they were numbered, though the Scriptures are silent on

that point. Here again he is wise above what is written. According to his own rules, we have no right to "suppose" any such thing. The Scriptures say nothing of this taxing in the one case, nor numbering in the other.

Again,—he states it, as if it were an indisputable fact, that what he calls the *second* numbering was six months after the first. Of that there is no evidence. And what could be the use of numbering the people twice within six months?

There are simply two things mentioned here—a taxing, and a numbering. The silver to be collected by tax was needed for making sockets to the sanctuary, Ex. xxxviii. : 27, and would not be required till the tabernacle was nearly erected. It was reared up on the first day of the first month of the second year.—Ex. xi. : 17. On the first day of the *next month*, the command was given to number the people "*after their families*." The direction for taking the poll-tax does not say that it is to be done immediately, but "*when* thou takest the sum of the Children of Israel." There is no evidence that there were even two months between these transactions. Any one can see that these two things are supplementary, and form parts of one business. In Ex. xxx. : 12 it is written: "When thou takest the *sum* of the Children of Israel after their number, (marg. *them that are to be numbered*), then shall they give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord."

In Num. 1: "Take ye the sum of all the congregation of the Children of Israel after their families, by the house of their fathers, with the number of their names." Two things are wanted—the sum of the Children of Israel *after their number*, for collecting the tax; and the sum *after their families*, for recording their names. When we learn that these two things were done almost at the same time, we may reasonably conclude they are connected. The numbering, therefore, after the tax, would be little else than arranging the rolls already provided. It is not surprising, therefore, that the numbers, *according to the taxing*, and those *according to the registration*, should agree—it would be strange if they did not.

Thus it appears that the more we examine into the minute details of these heavenly records, the more irresistible the evidence of their perfect accuracy; and the more we study them, the greater will be our reverence for their blessed contents. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."

CHAPTER XII.

THE ISRAELITES DWELLING IN TENTS.

"Take ye every man for them which are in his tents." Exodus xvi.: 16.

Colenso thinks this command implies that every one of Israel dwelt in tents—allowing ten to each tent, they must have had two hundred thousand tents. "This statement," he says, "conflicts strangely with that in Lev. xxiii.: 42-43, where it is assigned as a reason for their *dwelling in booths* for seven days at the feast of tabernacles, "that your generations may know that I made the Children of Israel to dwell in booths when I brought them out of the land of Egypt."

He insists moreover, that, as the word for tent (*Ochel*), is different from that which is translated booth, (*Suchah*), they cannot mean the same thing. Then how could the Children of Israel acquire all these tents? They had not prepared them in Egypt; for the blood of the paschal-lamb was to be sprinkled on "the two *side posts*, and lintels, or upper *door-posts* of their houses, Ex. xii.: 7, and none of them was to go out of the *door of his house*." Therefore, they all dwelt, not in tents, but in houses. They had no time to prepare tents, for they fled *in haste*; and if they had them, how could they carry them? One tent to hold two persons, he says, will weigh twenty-five to forty pounds; an ox might carry four, and then they would need fifty thousand oxen. Besides, he thinks the Hebrew tents were made of hair or skin, and were, therefore, much heavier. One ox might have carried one such tent with its appendages. Therefore, they would need two hundred thousand oxen.

Upon all this I would remark:—

Firstly,—that Colenso's statement that *Ochel*—a tent, and *Suchah*—a booth, never mean the same thing, only exposes his ignorance of the Hebrew language. *Ochel* sometimes means a *house*, not a tent.—1 Kings vii.: 66; Ps. cxxxii.: 3. The generic meaning is *dwelling*. The generic meaning of *Suchah*, is a *covering*, from a verb which signifies to weave, to cover. It is applied to the tabernacle of God.—See Psalm xxvii.: 5, where the two words are used in the same verse referring to the very same thing. He says, "It is used in 2 Sam. xi.: 11 for tents, but improperly." So it seems he thinks he knows Hebrew better

than those that wrote it. We must, however, prefer Moses to Colenso, who would tell us that *Suchah*—a roof or covering, is the generic term of which tent and booth are species, comp. 1 Kings xx. : 13-16; Job xxxvi. : 29.

Secondly,—I have already shown that there were no such numbers of the Israelites, and so they would not need so many tents.

Thirdly,—Colenso is again mistaken when he says they had no tents in Egypt. The statements about door-posts and lintels apply quite as well to tents, as to houses of brick or stone. The chief employment of the Israelites was that of shepherds, whose designation was, "*such as dwell in tents*,"—Gen. iv. 20; Cant. i. : 8; 1 Chron. iv. 41, v. 9-10.

Nor is it true that they could only have hair or skins to cover their tents. If they could make scarlet, and fine-twined linen, they could make light coverings for tents—and we have no reason to say they did not.

We shall have occasion to notice in another place the assumption that the Israelites had no warning, or time to prepare, before they left Egypt. We notice, in passing, that centuries before, they had warning of their leaving.—Gen. xv. : 14, xlv. : 4; Exodus iii. : 16.

Fourthly,—there is no evidence that every one, or even a large fraction of all Israel dwelt in tents. The text referred to, reads thus :—

"This is the thing which the Lord hath commanded : Gather of it every man according to his eating, an omer for every man, according to the number of your persons; take ye every man for them which are in his tents." Amongst a people migrating there are always those who are tender, and those who are strong. The former, such as women and children, and the old, require tents, the others can do without them. Hence, the direction here given is three-fold. First, every man is to gather what is needed, "according to his eating." Second, how much on an average, "an omer for every man." Third, those in charge of tents are to provide "for them which are in his tents." This last part of the command beautifully teaches that the tender—the feeble—the dependent—should be duly cared for "in the tents."

As to the carrying of the tents, I suppose the Egyptians would be glad to give them wagons, or anything else, to take them out as they did to bring them in. When they gave them their jewels, they would willingly give them anything to get rid of them, for said they : "We be all dead men." There were other animals to

carry burdens besides oxen; and it would be as easy for a million of people to convey what they needed, as it would be for ten; for, if they needed more, there were the more to carry it.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE ISRAELITES ARMED.

"The Children of Israel went up harnessed out of the land of Egypt."—Ex. xiii.: 18.

Colenso assumes that every one of the six hundred and three thousand five hundred and fifty were armed. They were armed on certain occasions.—Joshua i.: 14, iv.: 12; Jud. vii.: 11. He thinks they must have brought their arms from Egypt. Then he says:—

"It is, however, inconceivable that these down-trodden, oppressed people should have been allowed by Pharaoh to possess arms, so as to turn out, at a moment's notice, six hundred thousand armed men. We must suppose that the *whole body* of six hundred thousand warriors were armed when they were numbered Num. i.: 3, under Sinai. They possessed arms, surely at that time, according to the story. Where did they get them, unless they took them out of Egypt? If then, the historical veracity of this part of the Pentateuch is to be maintained, we must believe that six hundred thousand armed men (though it is inconceivable how they obtained their arms), had, by reason of their long servitude, become so debased, and inhuman in their cowardice, (and yet they fought bravely enough with Amalek a month afterwards), that they could not strike a single blow for their wives and children, if not for their own lives and liberties, but could only weakly wail and murmur against Moses, saying: "It had been better for us to serve the Egyptians, than that we should die in this wilderness." Exodus xiv.: 12.

We need hardly repeat that the Bible never says there were six hundred thousand warriors—much less that so many were armed.

It is alleged that they were certainly armed when they were numbered at Sinai.—Num. i. We only read of them "that are *able* to go forth to war." Are we then to conclude that whenever a census of any people is taken, "all that are *able* to go forth to war." are *armed* warriors?

Some having supposed that they may have stripped the dead bodies of the Egyptians that floated ashore, Colenso thinks "this is far-fetched, especially, when the narrative itself is silent on the

subject; and farther, while body-armor might have been obtained in this way, how could swords, and shields, and spears, be washed ashore by the waves?"

Why not? would not these weapons be fastened to their bodies? how could the bodies come ashore without them? "But," says Colenso, "the Bible story says nothing about this stripping of the dead—as surely it must have done if it really took place."

It would seem he can insist upon "suppositions" against the story, but none are admissible, when they would harmonize it. We must not then suppose that a hand or foot was moved, saved what is stated in the writings! Verily if every thing that happened had been written, our Bible had been greater far than the Shasters of India.

The Israelites, doubtless, could get armor enough for all that could use them. It is very natural for us to think of armor according to our own age; but the armor of those days was of the rudest kind. The rib of an ox often served for a sword or spear. The bow and arrow took the place of a rifle; and other harness was in like manner primitive. Iron and steel weapons were made, of course, but they were not very common. But we must repeat that the Scriptures nowhere say that they were armed at all—"they went up *harnessed*." What means that term? A careful examination of the subject will show that it signifies only that they were equipped for the journey. "The people took their dough before it was leavened, their *kneading troughs being bound up with their clothes upon their shoulders*." Thus were they *harnessed*. How many of them had armor we cannot tell; but it is not wonderful that they should dread an encounter with the Egyptians who had the advantage of them in every respect.

Many of Colenso's errors arise from his understanding little of matters of antiquity. When it is said, "They went up *harnessed*." I suppose he would think of the polished-steel sword—the glittering spear—the minnie rifle, and burnished helmet, with knapsacks, &c., &c., and wonders how they could have got them all; and well he might, for it would have been hard to get *such* harness three thousand four hundred years ago.

I do not believe that the term *harnessed* refers to their armor at all. It is applied, not to the warriors, but to *all the people*, and seems to signify their being equipped for the journey—"Their kneading troughs, and clothes, being bound upon their shoulders." The Bible does not say they were *armed*—much less does it say what, or how many arms they had. Colenso's difficulty in this matter is, therefore, wholly without foundation.

them
fami
away
did t
U
"
tion,
pass
day
this
throu
born
It
for t
and
mean
will
is dis
s) v.
TH
not b
such
been
the r
matt
the c
were
silver
"inc
say v
actual
To
shoul
In
both
more
you g
out h
let ev

CHAPTER XIV.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE PASSOVER.

"Then Moses called for all the elders of Israel, and said unto them: Draw out now, and take you a lamb according to your families, and kill the passover; And the Childrer of Israel went away, and did as Jehovah had commanded Moses and Aaron; so did they."—Ex. xii.: 21-23.

Upon this Colenso makes his comments thus:—

"That is to say, in *one single day*, the whole immense population, as large as the city of London, was instructed to keep the passover, and actually did keep it. I have said, "in one single day; for the first notice of any such feast to be kept, is given in this very chapter, where we find it written, v. 12: "I will pass through the land of Egypt *this night*, and will smite all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both man and beast!"

It cannot be said that they had notice several days before hand, for they were to "*take*" the lamb on the tenth day of the month, and "*kill*" it on the fourteenth, v. 3, 6, and so v. 12, only means to say, "on *that* night—the night of the fourteenth—I will pass through the land of Egypt;" for the expression in v. 12, is distinctly *hazeh*, "*this*," not *hahu*, "*that*," as in xii.: 8: and so v. 14: "*This* day shall be unto you for a memorial, &c."

The difficulty which Colenso finds is simply this:—There could not be, he thinks, more than twelve hours to convey the order to such a multitude of people, (two millions), who must have been scattered over a vast extent of country. How then could the minute details of the command, concerning the passover, (a matter of life and death), be conveyed to each family, and not only the due preparations made for the service, but men and women were to borrow, at the same time, jewels of gold, and jewels of silver, so that they spoiled the Egyptians? This is the sum of his "incredibility" in this part. It would be a sufficient answer to say with McCaul: "That similar things, quite as unlikely, have actually been done, and therefore it cannot be impossible." But,—

To me it is a matter of surprise that such an imaginary difficulty should ever have been thought of.

In Chap. xi. we are informed of a preparatory warning given both to Pharaoh, and to Israel: "Yet will I bring *one plague more* upon Pharaoh, and upon Egypt; afterwards he will let you go hence; when he shall let you go, he shall surely thrust you out hence altogether. Speak now in the ears of the people, and let every man borrow (ask to give), of his neighbor, and every

woman of her neighbor, jewels of silver, and jewels of gold." When Moses left Pharaoh, after the ninth plague, he told him that he should "*see his face no more*;" which proves that he knew well what was to follow. Nor was this the first intimation. The first message that Moses brought to Israel was, that, "the Lord had seen their affliction, and had come down to deliver them," and *the people believed*.—Ex. III.: 7-8, IV.: 30-31. From *that time* they were waiting impatiently for the promised deliverance. The manner of it is then stated—Chap. XI.—how long before, we are not told; at least before the beginning of the passover-month. Then the particulars are stated in these words: "This month shall be unto you the beginning of months; it shall be the first month of the year unto you. Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel, saying: In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for a house." Surely no rational man will deny that this order must have been delivered, at least, in the beginning of the month. According to Colenso's logic, the order to "take" the lamb on the *tenth day*, and keep it up till the fourteenth, was issued on the *fourteenth*—i.e., *four days after it must be executed!*

But (says Colenso), the first notice of the feast is given "*in this very chapter*." That is not so—but suppose it were—did every thing, written in the *same chapter*, happen on the *same day*?

Again he rests his proof upon the pronoun Hazzeli—"this," which he says is to be distinguished from Hahn—"that," and implies that the things must be done on the self-same day on which it was spoken. He seems ignorant of the fact that these two pronouns in the Hebrew, as in English, refer, the one to the *first mentioned* the other to the *last*.—See Gen. VII.: 11-13. Moses having spoken of the tenth day, (v. 3) and then of the fourteenth, (v. 6) says, (v. 12) "I will pass through the land *this* (the last mentioned) night."

Many more evidences could be adduced to prove that, so far from Israel having only a few hours warning of the passover, and of their departure, they had a general intimation of it from the time that Moses came to Egypt, and particular instructions from the beginning of the month at least,—i.e., fourteen days before the event. There is, therefore, nothing incredible in the statement that any number of people, so instructed, should keep the passover, and depart from their houses the same night.

CHAPTER XV.

THE MARCH OUT OF EGYPT.

"And the Children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth," &c. Ex. xii. : 37-38.

Colenso refers to his own experience in this chapter, and says, he and his family were compelled one night to flee in great confusion, when a false alarm was made that a Zulu force was making its way "direct for our station, killing right and left." From his "experience" he insists that it is "utterly impossible and incredible that a multitude like that of Israel, amounting to two millions, with sick and aged, women in recent and imminent child-birth, and infants," &c, spread over an extensive country, could be summoned to start, and actually start, with all their flocks and herds, even very much cattle. Again he says:

"But this is but a very small part of the difficulty. We are required to believe that, in one single day, the order to start was communicated suddenly, at midnight, to every single family of every town and village, throughout a tract of country as large as Hertfordshire, but ten times as thickly peopled; that in obedience to such order, having just "borrowed" very largely from their Egyptian neighbors in all directions, (though, if we are to suppose Egyptians occupying the *same* territory with the Hebrews, the extent of it must be very much increased,) they then come in from all parts of the land of Goshen to Rameses, bringing with them the sick and infirm, the young and the aged, further, that, since receiving the summons, they had sent out to gather in all their flocks and herds, spread over so wide a district, and had driven them also to Rameses; and, lastly, that having done all this since they were roused at midnight, they were started again that very same day, and marched on to Succoth, not leaving a single sick or infirm person, a single woman in child-birth, or even a 'single hoof,' Ex. x. : 26, behind them!"

In answer to all this I remark:—

Firstly,—As already noted the Scriptures never mention *two millions*, but that is of no account, for we may allow that it would be as easy for two millions to start as for ten thousand, on short notice.

Secondly,—It is surely absurd to speak of them as being all "roused at midnight," as if they had been all asleep in their beds, never thinking of a journey, when, as we have already seen, they were warned long before to be in readiness, and to show how ready they must be to go, they must, that night, eat the passover "with

their shoes on their feet and their staff in their hand." The events of that night, and their corresponding duties, were duly foretold to them at least half a month before. To speak of them as "suddenly summoned" to depart, is to contradict the plainest declarations of Scripture.

Thirdly,—This critic seems anxious to impress upon us that there must have been many sick and weak, and women in confinement. The Bible declares the reverse. "*There was not one feeble person among their tribes.*"—Ps. cv. : 37. It is not necessary that women in confinement should be helpless for weeks. The Scriptures show that the Hebrews were usually "lively" and strong.

But Colenso introduces another difficulty. He says the people travelling fifty abreast "would have formed a dense column *twenty-two miles long*," so that the last of them could not have started till the first had advanced two days' journey, and then the sheep and cattle must have formed another vast column covering a greater space, and such grass as there was, if not eaten would be trodden down by the first ranks. "What, then, did those millions of sheep and oxen live upon during this journey from Rameses to Succoth, and from Succoth to Etham, and from Etham to the Red Sea?"

But what if neither people nor cattle did travel *fifty abreast*? The Scriptures say nothing about the number abreast. Reason would suggest that any people, in such a case, would not concern themselves about how many were in any rank. They would most likely travel just as it might be convenient. They were limited to no road nor space.

It is not very likely that the cattle would be driven in "dense columns," since the whole country was before them, and they had their freedom of it.

He still further insists that they could not have performed the journey to the sea in *three days*. That the shortest route from Rameses to the Red Sea would have required them to travel at least seventeen to twenty miles a day in order to reach it in three days.

He follows Kurtz in locating Rameses about fifty or sixty miles from the Red Sea. Dr. Robinson, whose authority is better than Kurtz, says that Rameses was near the Bitter Lakes, and distant from the sea thirty or thirty-five miles. Rodiger makes it still nearer. It is, therefore, more likely that they would only require to travel from ten to twelve miles daily to reach the sea on the third. But it is not said that they reached the Red Sea on the *third day*. That is a "pure assumption." The places named only mark the *line of their march*; nothing is said about the time

on the journey. "They journeyed from Rameses to Succoth."—**Ex. xii. : 37.** "They took their journey from Succoth and encamped in Etham, in the edge of the Wilderness."—**xiii. : 20.** "And the Lord spake unto Moses saying, speak unto the Children of Israel, that they turn and encamp before Pihahiroth, between Migdol and the Sea."—**xiv. : 1-2.** Colenso takes for granted that every encampment marks a day's journey. We are told that after having passed through the Sea by night, they went three days' journey into the Wilderness and came to Marah.—**xv. : 22-23,** thence to Elim, **v. 27,** and thence again to the Wilderness of Sin, **xvi.** According to Colenso's principles of interpretation, that each station denotes a day's march (save the three expressly mentioned), they must have arrived at the last named place on the *ninth* day after their departure from Rameses. Instead of that they only reached it on the *fifteenth day of the second month.*—**xvi.** Thus it appears that the difficulties and improbabilities alleged against the Pentateuch exist only in the imaginations of disordered minds. When we seek for them in the Scriptures they are not to be found. Instead there appears, in bold relief, the most remarkable evidence of the *fidelity of the Bible.*

CHAPTER XVI.

THE SHEEP AND CATTLE OF THE ISRAELITES IN THE DESERT.

"It is certain," says Colenso, "that the story represents them (the Children of Israel) as possessing these [great] flocks and herds during the whole of forty years in the Wilderness. Thus, in the *second* year, Moses asks, 'Shall the flocks and the herds be slain for them to suffice them?'—**Num. xi. : 22.** And in the *fortieth* year we read, 'the children of Reuben and the children of Gad had a very great multitude of cattle.'—**Num. xxxii. : 1.** . . . We find that, at the end of the first year, they kept the second Passover under Sinai, **Num. ix. : 5,** and, therefore, we may presume, had at that time, as before, two hundred thousand male lambs of the first year at their command, and two millions of sheep and oxen close at hand.

"Again, it cannot be supposed that the flocks and herds were scattered far and wide, during the sojourn of the people in the Wilderness, and so were able to find pasture. The story says nothing, and implies nothing, whatever of this, but as far as it proves anything it proves the contrary, since we find the whole body of the people together on all occasions. . . . At all events, during nearly twelve months,—a year all but ten days, says Kurtz,

Let Colenso account for these unmistakeable traces of *water,*

they were all collected under Sinai. . . . Hence we find the command in Ex. xxxiv. : 3, 'Neither let the flocks nor herds feed before that mount.'"

He insists that the Wilderness was then what it is now, "a desert land," a "waste howling wilderness."—Deu. xxxii. : 10, viii. : 15. Hence it was quite impossible that these flocks could be pastured there.

To these remarks I would reply :—

Firstly,—It is no proof that they had great flocks and herds for *forty* years because they had them the *first* and *second*. Nor does the Scripture to which he refers (Num. xi. : 22) state that they had them even the second year. Moses asks the question, "shall the flocks and the herds be slain for them to suffice them?" What flocks and herds? The article (*the*) is not in the original. "Shall flocks and herds be slain for them, or shall all the fish of the sea be gathered together to suffice them." If that proves that they *had* the flocks and herds mentioned, it follows that they had *all the fish of the sea*; for the one is spoken of in the same terms as the other.

Is it likely that the people would have murmured for flesh and yet spare numerous flocks in their possession? Is it reasonable that Moses should say, "Whence should I have flesh to give unto all this people?" when he had (as Colenso says) flocks and herds without number? It is a new way of proving that they had great herds, to refer us to a text which tells us that the people lusted for flesh and it could not be provided but by a great miracle!

The last we hear of flocks, after the Israelites left Egypt, was under Sinai, and we are not informed that they were large. They probably existed only as a remnant.

We may turn Colenso's manner of reasoning against him, and say, "The Scriptures say not a word of these flocks in the desert during thirty-eight years, which surely they must have done if such did exist."

But, says Colenso, the children of Reuben and of Gad had a great multitude of cattle. He admits that many were taken from the Midianites, but they would be distributed among all the tribes. That is not said. Nay, more, the very mention of these *two tribes* possessing so many, implies that the others had *not* many. It is most likely that the cattle would fall into the hands of few, while other spoil would suit others better. At all events some of them could not but have a great multitude of cattle, since they took from the Midianites 675,000 sheep, 72,000 beeves and 1,000 asses.—Num. xxxi. : 32-34.

only mark the *line of their march*; nothing is said about the time

Nor would they need but a fraction of the number of the sheep he mentions to enable them to keep the Passover under Sinai. He reckons two million people, and one lamb to every ten. We have already shown that both estimates are far astray.

At all events, it is no proof that they had great flocks all the forty years, even if they had them at the end of the first. And how does he prove that the flocks were "all collected in one place with the people?" He says they were with the people under Sinai, for Moses was commanded not to let the herds feed before the mount, *i.e.*, the evidence of their being there, is the command that they should *not be allowed there!*

"The story says nothing and implies nothing" that would conflict with the herds being scattered any distance. Common sense would suggest that they were certainly not in the same place with the people.

That there was pasturage in the region of Mt. Sinai is evident from the fact that Moses went thither before with the flocks of his father-in-law—Ex. III. : 1.

He refers to Deu. xxxii. : 10, viii. : 15, Jer. ii. : 6, and says the country has undergone no change. He is unfortunate in his choice of texts, for every one of these to which he directs us, speaks of the Divine interposition in protecting and providing for Israel and their flocks. "Thy paths drop fatness. They drop upon the *pastures of the wilderness*, and the little hills rejoice on every side." It is distinctly stated that the Lord went before his people, and prepared and made the wilderness, what it had never been before, and likely will never be again. "The heavens dropped at the presence of God. Thou, O God, didst send a *plentiful rain*, whereby thou didst confirm thine inheritance when it was weary, thy congregation hath dwelt therein."—Ps. lxxviii. : 7-10.

Colenso makes the following quotation from Canon Stanley to prove that the *miabar* (desert) was a place where there was no moisture, and no grass could grow. He says:—

"I cannot too often repeat that these wadys are exactly like rivers, *except in having no water*; and it is this appearance of torrent-bed, and banks, and clefts in the rocks for tributary streams, and at times even rushes and shrubs fringing their course, which gives to the whole wilderness a doubly dry and thirsty aspect, — *signs of water, water everywhere*, and not a drop to drink."

After noticing what many might mistake for signs of volcanic action, he adds: "Everywhere there are signs of the *action of water*, nowhere of fire."

Let Colenso account for these unmistakeable traces of *water*,

water everywhere. An effect must have had a cause. If these water marks are there so clear, these "rivers and tributary streams" must have run *some time*, and when more likely than when the Lord made the "*heavens drop abundantly*" for the supply of his people? Stanley and others declare that a change must have taken place, and this accords with the Scripture that saith, "He turneth the wilderness into a standing water."—Ps. cvii. : 35-38. There is, therefore, *firstly*, no evidence that the Israelites had any flocks in the desert, for more than thirty-eight years. *Secondly*, if they had, there is no evidence from any source to prove that they could not, *at that time*, have found pasturage enough. He that said, "I have led you forty years in the wilderness, your clothes are not waxen old upon you, and thy shoe is not waxen old upon thy foot" (Deut. xxiv. : 5), would not have suffered their flocks to perish for want of grass. *By the way.* Why did not Colenso raise a great difficulty upon that text, and prove that it was impossible that clothes and shoes could last forty years? It would have been as likely as those he has produced.

He says that Num. xx. : 5, ("neither is there any water to drink,") and Deut. viii. : 15, prove that the water from the smitten rock did not follow them. The latter text reads thus: "Who led thee through the great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents and scorpions, where there was no water, who brought thee forth water out of the rock of flint." God's mercies are here recounted, and among them this one, that whereas the wilderness was dry, he supplied water in a miraculous manner, "out of the rock of flint." It implies that the water *did* follow them, since they wanted *no more* till they came to Kadesh, where the miracle was repeated.—Num. xx. : 5. If the water from the rock in Rephidim did not follow them, where could they get *any water at all*, if, as Colenso says, the desert was so dry? The second miracle for their supply indicates that the stream from Rephidim did not fail till then.

Moses says, he did cast the small dust of the golden calf into the "*brook* that descended out of the mount."—Deut. ix. : 21. The psalmist says, "He brought *streams* also out of the rock, and caused water to run down like rivers. He smote the rock that the water gushed out, and the *streams overflowed*," Ps. lxxviii. : 16, 20, and again, "He opened the rock and the waters gushed out, *they ran in the dry places like a river*."—Ps. cv. : 46. Paul says, "They drank of the spiritual rock that *followed* them." These divinely taught witnesses all agree. There are no evidences

against them in the Bible or out of it. Whom shall we believe, Moses, David and Paul, or Colenso?

CHAPTER XVII.

THE NUMBER OF THE ISRAELITES COMPARED WITH THE EXTENT OF THE LAND OF CANAAN.

Referring to Ex. xxiii. : 27-30, Colenso maintains that the promised land had an area of only 11,000 square miles, or 7,000,000 acres, and as there were about 2,000,000 of Israel, the population would have been as thick as that of the three counties of England, Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex, or *twenty* times as thick as that of Natal, in which leopards, wild boars, hyenas and jackals are killed, but many, like himself, have lived there many years and never saw one; therefore, the story of the Pentateuch about "the land becoming desolate," and "the beast of the field multiplying against the people" is incredible.

This logic reminds me of a brave son of Erin, who when he was told that there were two witnesses who swore that they saw him commit the crime, replied, that he could find *twenty* to swear that they *did not* see him do it. The Bishop has lived so long in *Natal* and never saw one of these ferocious beasts, when others write of their being in *Palestine* three thousand years ago, he exclaims "incredible."

Firstly,—He takes for granted, as before, that Israel numbered two millions. His *conclusions* are, therefore, astray. Nor does he consider how many of them would be helpless or defenceless, such as women and children.

Secondly,—The boundaries of the promised land are not as he has described them. Canaan was but a *portion* of it.

In the very next verse, following that which he quoted, it is stated, "I will set thy bounds from the *Red Sea* even to the *Sea of the Philistines*, and from the *desert* unto the *river*." See also the promise: Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the River of Egypt unto the Great River, the River Euphrates.—Gen. xv. : 18. See also Dent. xi. : 24, Josh. i. : 4. Though they settled first in Canaan, David went to *recover his border at the river Euphrates*.—2 Sam. viii. : 3, and Solomon reigned "from the river unto the land of the Philistines, and unto the border of Egypt."—2 Chron. ix. : 26. Even if there had been two millions, what would they be on such a vast country as this?

Thirdly,—If Colenso has not seen such wild beasts in Natal in this age, they may have been in Palestine in ages long past. The beasts of prey which he names are only small craft compared with what ranged in the East. How many such bishops would be needed to face such a lion as Samson slew? Jud. xiv. : 6, or the lion and bear from which David delivered the lambs? 1 Sam. xvii. : 35, or the lions that infested the heathen? 2 Kings, xvii. : 25, or the bears that tore the wicked children? 2 Kings, ii. : 24. These are but samples of the ravages made when Israel had multiplied in the land, and they are mentioned *incidentally*.

Though the province of Bengal is densely peopled, it is still infested with tigers. Colenso errs by squaring everything according to what *he* has seen and known.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE NUMBER OF THE PRIESTS AT THE EXODUS COMPARED WITH THEIR DUTIES, AND THE PROVISIONS MADE FOR THEM.

Colenso thinks that offerings were very frequent and numerous. There were burnt, peace, meat and sin offerings. Offerings for every woman after childbirth—every leper—ceremonial cleansings—Nazarites, and the daily morning and evening offerings. For all this work Colenso says there were only Aaron and his two sons. None other were allowed, for “the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death.”—Num. iii. : 10.

“How was it possible that these three men should have discharged all these duties for such a vast multitude? The births among 2,000,000 people may be reckoned at 250 a day, for which, consequently, 500 sacrifices would have to be offered daily. These, at five minutes each, would take forty-two hours.”

Then where could they have got these two hundred and fifty turtle doves daily, *i. e.*, ninety thousand annually, in the Wilderness?

Moreover, these pigeons were to be eaten by the priests.—Num. xviii. : 9-11, 14-18, Lev. vii. : 7-10 and 34. Each must devour eighty-eight pigeons every day, besides other flesh!

In Canaan thirteen cities were assigned to these two sons of Aaron and their families!

I shall not dispute about the number of sons and grand-sons of Aaron. There were more than two, certainly. Nor shall we

contest the continued error of computing the number of Israel at two millions, thus increasing the number of sacrifices, but I remark:—

Firstly,—If this reasoning were correct it would prove more than the Bishop designs. It would prove that no *rational* man ever wrote these books. If the books say that, every priest must eat in the holy place, daily, eighty-eight pigeons, besides a similar quantity of other flesh. I venture that the most fabulous book in print cannot beat that. How did *anybody* ever write it! and how did any one *believe* it!!

Secondly,—Even Colenso is forced to admit that many laws given to Israel in the desert were *prospective*, and could not be applied *at that time*. Directions are given concerning offerings of oil, wine, wheat, first fruits, and “whatsoever is first *ripe*.”—Num. xviii. : 12–13, which must have been intended to apply to the people when *settled* in Canaan. Colenso allows that, but insists that the *other offerings* must have been offered in the desert. In the order concerning them there is no distinction of that kind.

If there were not beasts to offer, the priests would not be distressed with the labor of offering them. They would not be under the necessity of eating eighty-eight pigeons daily in the holy place, if there were none to be had. There is an end of that difficulty.

Nevertheless it was a fit time to promulgate the laws, when the people were collected to hear and learn them. They must learn the law before they could obey it. Hence the manner of its promulgation. “Speak unto the children of Israel and say unto them, *when ye come into the land* of your habitations, which I give unto you, and will make an offering by fire unto the Lord.”—Num. xv. : 2. Moreover, there was no necessity laid upon the people to offer the sacrifices specified, in *all circumstances*. Most of them were voluntary. “If any man of you will bring an offering unto the Lord.”—Lev. i. : 2.

Thirdly,—Let any one read Num. iii and xviii, and say if Aaron and his sons were all that were allowed to offer sacrifices. Moses is instructed to bring the *tribe of Levi* near, and present them to Aaron, the priest, that they may minister with him. v. 6. Then their service is defined, v. 7–8, “to do the service of the tabernacle.” Aaron and his sons are appointed over them, and “the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death.” The Levites could not be *strangers*, for they were *joined* to Aaron and his sons, who had the charge. They were “to bear the iniquity of the sanctuary,” and the Levites were “to do the service.” There-

simply affirms that the large numbers of the Midianites said to be

fore none of these were allowed any inheritance among the children of Israel, and the thirteen cities would be little enough to serve them "for to dwell in."

CHAPTER XIX.

THE PRIESTS, AND THEIR DUTIES AT THE CELEBRATION OF THE PASSOVER.

"Again," (says Colenso) "how did these three priests manage at the celebration of the Passover? We are told, 2 Ch. xxx. : 16, xxxv. : 11, that the people killed the Passover, but the priests sprinkled the blood from their hands, and the Levites slayed them. Hence, when they kept the second Passover, under Sinai, Num ix. : 5, where we must suppose that 150,000 lambs were killed at one time . . . each priest must have had to sprinkle the blood of 50,000 lambs in about two hours, that is, at the rate of about four hundred lambs every minute, for two hours together. Besides which, in the time of Hezekiah and Josiah, when it was desired to keep the Passover strictly, 'in such sort as it was written,' 2 Chron. xxx. : 5, the lambs were manifestly killed in the court of the Temple, we must suppose, then, that the paschal lambs in the Wilderness were killed in the Court of the Tabernacle . . . in accordance with the Levitical law, that all burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings should be killed "before Jehovah," at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation. . . But the area of that court contained, as we have seen, only 1,602 square yards, and could only have held, when thronged, about 5,000 people. How, then, are we to conceive of 150,000 lambs being killed within it by, at least, 150,000 people, in the space of two hours, that is, at the rate of 1,250 lambs a minute?"

These very formidable like difficulties belong to Colenso, whose fertile imagination has conceived and brought them forth. They are in the Holy Bible *nowhere*.

Firstly,—There is not a word about these great numbers at all, neither of people nor lambs.

Secondly,—There is not a word about the lambs being killed in the Court of the Tabernacle, nor in that of the Temple. And even if they had been killed in the Court of the Temple, in Canaan, in the days of Hezekiah, it does not follow that they were killed in the Court of the Tabernacle, in the Wilderness, in the days of Moses. "They kept the Passover in such sort as it was written," but there is nothing written about killing the lambs in the court.

Aaron. There were more than two, certainly. Nor shall we

He says that a penalty of death was laid upon any who killed an ox, &c., in the camp, and did not bring it to the door of the Tabernacle.—Lev. xvii. : 2-6. They might be *killed*, but not *offered*, without bringing them to the door of the Tabernacle. The order was against idolatry.—See v. 7. In regard to the burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, &c., they must kill the bullock *before the Lord*. Colenso thinks *that* must mean in the Court of the Tabernacle. He has not understood it. Nimrod was a mighty hunter "*before the Lord*."—Gen. x. : 9. Did he hunt in the Court of the Tabernacle? The men of Sodom were "sinners before the Lord exceedingly."—Gen. xiii. : 13. They did not dwell in the Court of the Tabernacle! Nor does the phrase before the door of the Tabernacle mean in the court. Neither was the Passover a sacrifice similar to any of the others named, and was not regulated by laws that governed them.

Thirdly,—There is not a word about the priests sprinkling the blood of the passover lambs in the Tabernacle, nor anything that implies it. When the Passover was *first* celebrated, there were no priests at all about it, and they might, therefore, celebrate it again in "such sort as it was written," without them. In another case, when a few data in the Chronicles militated against the so called difficulties raised by the bishop, he refused the testimony; saying, "we are not concerned with the Chronicles. We must abide by the data of the Pentateuch itself." Now he takes that very book to raise his difficulty, by assuming that what was done in Hezekiah's days, must have been *so* done in the days of Moses, eight hundred years before! But we care not how many books of the Bible are brought forward, we have shown that the alleged difficulties have not a shadow of existence, and we stand to our motto, "The Scriptures cannot be broken."

CHAPTER XX.

THE WAR ON MIDIAN.

It is quite unnecessary to take any account of the proposed difficulties handled under this caption. Colenso takes a sort of retrospective view of what he had advanced, and delights in affirming and reaffirming that, "in its own essential statements of matters of fact, the narrative of the Exodus is full of contradictions." He simply affirms that the large numbers of the Midianites said to be

plain and taken captive by Israel are incredible. As there is nothing in the form of argument, it needs no refutation.

Even if there were an error about the number of the Midianites in Num. xxxi., it would not affect, seriously, the fidelity of the history. Numbers were written in letters, many of which, in Hebrew, are very similar, and might very likely be mistaken by a scribe. Such errors would only prove that scribes are not infallible. But there is no evidence even of such an error.

It is alleged that the events recorded in Num. xxxiii.: could not have happened in the time stated, i. e., from the death of Aaron to the first day of the eleventh month.—Deu. i.: 3. It is taken for granted that these events were all successive, and none of them simultaneous, which may be incorrect.

Colenso says the war with King Arad must have occupied at least a month. I shou'd think a few days might be sufficient. He allows another month for marching, in which they made nine encampments. When we look at the distance, we would judge nine days, i. e., one for each encampment, quite enough, and so on. We might show the whole of this chapter in like manner, a creature of a disordered imagination, but enough. I dare say the reader is tired of the subject, and I hasten to the conclusion.

CONCLUSION.

"I cannot but feel," says the Bishop, "that, having thus been impelled to take an active part in showing the groundlessness of that notion of Scripture inspiration, which so many have long regarded as the very foundation of their faith and hope, a demand may be made upon me for something to supply the loss,—for something to fill up the aching void, which will undoubtedly be felt at first. Here *that* faith, which has been built only, or mainly, upon the basis of the historical truth of the Pentateuch, must be in danger of collapsing, together with its support."

This is reasonable. The man who tries to tear from us the foundation of all our hopes for time and for eternity, ought to be ready to show us a "more excellent way"—to furnish a foundation more solid and secure, which some other sceptic will not, in turn, be able to demolish.

What, then, are we to have instead of our God-given Bible? Let the reader pause and consider, *what* would fill that "aching void?" What does this Christian Bishop offer? Hear him. He says:—

"I would, however, venture to refer the reader for some words, which, I would humbly hope, by God's mercy, may minister in some measure to the comfort and support of troubled minds, under present circumstances, to my lately published *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*." !!!

This is magnanimous ! When the Pentateuch is gone, and with it, as a necessary consequence, the whole of both the Old and New Testaments, the distressed Christian, robbed of all his heavenly hopes, may console himself with *Bishop Colenso's "Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans !"* One might be a little curious to know what may be in this *new Bible*, which is to take the place of the old one. Will it be the sound teachings of St. Paul ? not likely from this divine. He says :

"The main essence of that teaching is, that our righteousness is wholly of faith—a living trust in God's love—that we must all, and *may* all, depend entirely on our Father's mercy."

This might seem orthodox ; but question, is it the mercy of *God in Christ* he means ? No, for he says the heathen may do the same. He quotes with admiration their maxims, such as :

"Whatever Ram willeth, that without the least difficulty shall be, why, therefore, do ye kill yourselves with grief, which grief can avail you nothing."

This is the sort of faith recommended to us—dark, dismal *fate*. You need not grieve, because it will help you nothing.

"In order that he may diffuse happiness God becometh subservient to all.

"I take for my spiritual food the water and the leaf of Ram.

"Whatever is to be, will be, therefore long not for grief, nor joy ; because by seeking the one you may find the other."

Let these sentences suffice as a few texts from the *new Bible*, from which we are to gather peace and comfort.

The heathen, without the Bible, may know what is called natural religion ; but if they can trust in the mercy of *our Father*, without the knowledge of Christ, why are they perishing ? Let this teacher go and tell the poor Brahman, suffering self-inflicted torments, that it is all in vain, he should not grieve, for "whatever Ram willeth, shall be." Will these doctrines of the *new Bible* soften the heathen's heart, or ease his troubled conscience, and give peace to his soul ? Alas ! this sort of theology has been tried many thousand years, and the heathen is as far from God and from peace as ever.

I desire, in a few closing remarks, to lay before the reader some thoughts relative to our blessed Bible, which has been so often attacked by deceitful traitors *within* the Church, and desperate foes *without*.

I hope the perusal of the preceeding pages has helped to confirm the reader an immovable confidence in the Divine Authority and fidelity of the Bible.

No other book has been subjected to tests so many and so severe, yet it remains in every part invulnerable.

By the process which Colenso instituted against the Bible, the book never was printed which would not be condemned as false from beginning to end. Let me write what is not written, and wrest what is, and I will make any book incredible.

REFLECTIONS.

I remark:—

Firstly,—The Bible, Pentateuch and all, *exists, and has been acknowledged*, in all ages and countries, as being what it professes to be. How, then, did it come into the world, if not as it states; by a Divine Author? It could not have been written by a Jew (uninspired). Left to himself, he never would have written such a condemnation of himself and people. Nor by a Gentile, for he would not have known the laws and ordinances of the Jews, nor exposed himself and people as “accursed without the law.”

And if it was not written by *Moses at such a time*, how did the people unanimously agree to receive it, and impose upon themselves? Let any one try to bring in a *new* book, and offer it for the *first* time to any people, while its every page is an emphatic condemnation of them and their forefathers, and yet its historical matter *not true*. How quickly they would spurn from them both the book and its author!

Secondly,—This book (the Pentateuch and whole Bible,) has evidences of its accuracy and origin *within itself*;—*such* evidences as no reasonable reader would dispute.

It is said that one of the legal profession, accustomed to reason acutely, better acquainted with the statutes of earth than the statutes of heaven, disbelieved the Bible. He requested a friend to direct him where he could find evidence of the truth of the Bible. He was wisely directed to the *Bible itself*. This he thought an illogical way, to test the veracity of one by his own account of it. He was, nevertheless, induced to try the experiment. One morning the friend found him pacing his study, exclaiming, “*Where did he get that law?*” He had always thought Moses had been a clever fellow, acquainted with arts beyond his age, and had done by craft what the people thought were miracles,—that he had gone up to the top of Mt. St. Sinai, and by a display of fireworks deceived the people, and secured their obedience. But when he examined *Ex.*, ch. *xx.*, he found it impossible to account for the production of a law so absolutely perfect without superhuman aid. Upon the

theory of any sceptic it was impossible to answer the question, *Where did he get that law?* By the statements of the Scriptures themselves, the answer is easy and most reasonable. By no other is it possible. But it would be absurd and contradictory to suppose one honored and owned by the God of truth, deliberately writing, for a moral and religious guide, a book full of lies. "Now we know that God heareth not sinners, but if any man be a worshiper of God and doeth his will, him he heareth."—Jno. ix. : 31. There is no room for compromise here. Either the Scriptures, the whole Scriptures, are, as they profess to be, the *Truth of God*, or they are the most gigantic imposition ever introduced into this world. You cannot reject a part and own the rest. They are *one whole*, and either all true or all false. The New Testament gives a full history of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is that God who *must know* and *cannot lie*. In the days of his flesh the books of the Old Testament were all collected in one synagogue roll. What is our Lord's verdict concerning it? When a question was raised concerning the resurrection of the dead, he settles it by the writings of Moses in the Pentateuch. "That the dead are raised even Moses showed at the bush."—Luke xx. : 37. When the Jews persisted in obstinate unbelief, he brings forward the same Pentateuch as indisputable testimony. "Had ye believed Moses ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?"—Jno. v. : 46-7. And again: "They have Moses and the prophets, if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."—Luke xvi. : 29-31.

When he would make them understand the revelations of God, he began at *Moses* and the prophets, and expounded the things concerning himself, Luke xxvi. : 27, and his apostles followed his example. If the Pentateuch be unhistorical, so is the whole Bible, Old Testament and New Testament, for the one part is joined with the other. They must stand or fall together.

To suppose (as Colenso says) that our Lord sanctioned the Pentateuch because the Jews revered it, is to suppose that the God of Truth would confirm a lie. Such a thought is blasphemous.

If we look at the doctrines contained in the Pentateuch there is additional evidence of fidelity. All the doctrines of the Christian religion are there. The character of God—the creation of man—the fall—regeneration by the Spirit—the resurrection, and eternal life. In a word, "what we are to believe concerning God,

and what duty God requires of man." There is not a sentence there, teaching aught contrary to the purest morality, nor a syllable but teaches what is pure and lovely, and of good report. If this book is not divine there are none so, and man is altogether without a revelation from God,—left in darkness, and, alas, *how great* would be that darkness. Let one raise his eyes and say what the world would have been without the Bible, yea, what it would yet be if this book were taken away!

Dear reader, suffer a word of exhortation from a brother mortal. I trust you need no more to prove the perfect accuracy and truth of the Bible. It is not only *true*, it is *Divine*, every book of it—every chapter of it—every verse of it—every word of it. And if it is, all the worse for you and me if we have it *only* in our *pocket*. If it is not written in our *hearts* it is loaded with curses against us. That same Pentateuch, by divine authority, levels anathemas against the impenitent and unbelieving. "If thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes, . . . "Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field, cursed shall be thy basket and thy store. Cursed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy land, the increase of thy kine and the flocks of thy sheep. Cursed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out."—Deu. xxviii. : 16, 19. But that same book directs us to *Him* that takes away the curse—a seed in which all the families of the earth shall be *blessed*—a smitten *rock* from which flows a "*river of living water*." Oh, fellow sinner, come to this Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world, feed *on* Him, walk *in* Him, live *to* Him, and you may read in that infallible book, your title to a heavenly inheritance of blessings. "Blessed shalt thou be in the city, and blessed shalt thou be in the field, blessed shall be the fruit of thy body and the fruit of thy ground, and the fruit of thy cattl., the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep. Blessed shall be thy basket and thy store. Blessed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and blessed shalt thou be when thou goest out. The Lord shall command the blessing upon thee in thy store-house, and in all that thou settest thine hand unto, and he shall bless thee in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

AMEN.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
COLENSO'S PREFACE:	
HIS INSINUATIONS	5
HEBREW SLAVERY	8
THE FAMILY OF JUDAH	12
THE NUMBER OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL AT THE EXODUS	16
THE NUMBER OF FIRST BORN COMPARED WITH THE NUMBER OF MALE ADULTS	24
THE SOJOURNING OF THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL IN EGYPT	25
THE EXODUS OF ISRAEL IN THE FOURTH GENERA- TION	27
THE NUMBER OF ISRAEL AT THE TIME OF THE EX- ODUS	31
THE DANITES AND LEVITES AT THE TIME OF THE EXODUS	33
THE SIZE OF THE COURT OF THE TABERNACLE, COMPARED WITH THE NUMBER OF THE CON- GREGATION	35
MOSES AND JOSHUA ADDRESSING ALL ISRAEL	37
THE EXTENT OF THE CAMP COMPARED WITH THE PRIESTS' DUTIES, AND THE DAILY NECESSI- TIES OF THE PEOPLE	39
THE NUMBER OF THE PEOPLE AT THE FIRST MUS- TER, COMPARED WITH THE POLL-TAX LEVIED SIX MONTHS PREVIOUSLY	41
THE ISRAELITES DWELLING IN TENTS	43
THE ISRAELITES ARMED	45
THE INSTITUTION OF THE PASSOVER	47
THE MARCH OUT OF EGYPT	49
THE SHEEP AND CATTLE OF THE ISRAELITES IN THE DESERT	52
THE NUMBER OF THE ISRAELITES COMPARED WITH THE EXTENT OF THE LAND OF CANAAN	55
THE NUMBER OF THE PRIESTS COMPARED WITH THEIR DUTIES AND THE PROVISIONS MADE FOR THEM	56
THE PRIESTS AND THEIR DUTIES AT THE CELEBRA- TION OF THE PASSOVER	58
THE WAR ON MIDIAN	59
CONCLUSION	60
REFLECTIONS	62

ERRATA.

Page 14, line 21, for son's read sons'.

" 28, line 9, the following should be the order of the table:

	1 Gen.	2. Gen.	3 Gen.	4 Gen.	5 Gen.
Levi.	Konath.	Amram.	Moses.		
Levi.	Konath.	Amram.	Aaron.		
Levi.	Konath.	Vzziel.	Elzaphan.		
Pharez. &c.	Hezron.	Raur.	Amiradab.	Nashon.	

Page 29, line 10, for Zahah read Zahad.

" 30, line 12, for these read those.

" 36, line 8, f. r force read forced.

" 43, line 26, for Hahu read Hahu.

" 37, and so forward, add one to the No. of each chapter.